

A  
GRAMMAR  
OF THE  
HEBREW LANGUAGE.

BY  
WILLIAM HENRY GREEN,  
THIRD EDITION, 1872.

This book was published before 1923 A.D. and is therefore in the public domain in the United States of America.

Please check your own national copyright laws.

This digital edition was created by Robbie James Losee specifically for release into the public domain.

Distribution by any means, electronic or otherwise, is strongly encouraged! You may use this book however you like - you have my full permission.

The Wisdom of God is revealed in many ways. His creation testifies of it in ever so many wondrous and beautiful ways. It is my belief that, in keeping with the pattern of creation, the Word of God, no matter how oft explored and extensively studied, still holds vast treasures of beauty yet undiscovered.

It is my hope that you will find the freshness of discovery enticing enough to keep you coming back for more and more understanding of the Word of our Lord, and the fascinating language it was given in.

A  
GRAMMAR  
OF THE  
HEBREW LANGUAGE.

BY  
WILLIAM HENRY GREEN,  
PROFESSOR IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT PRINCETON, N. J.

THIRD EDITION,

NEW YORK:  
JOHN WILEY & SON, PUBLISHERS,  
2 CLINTON HALL, ASTOR PLACE.  
1872.

ENTERED, according to Act of Congress, in the year of 1861, by

JOHN WILEY,

in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

## P R E F A C E.

---

THIS work was begun at the instance of my friend, preceptor, and colleague, DR. J. ADDISON ALEXANDER. The aid of his counsels and suggestions was freely promised in the undertaking; and he was to give to it the sanction of his name before the public. It appears shorn of these advantages. A few consultations respecting the general plan of the book and the method to be observed in its preparation, were all that could be had before this greatest of American orientalists and scholars was taken from us. Deprived thus early of his invaluable assistance, I have yet found a melancholy satisfaction in the prosecution of a task begun under such auspices, and which seemed still to link me to one with whom I count it one of the greatest blessings of my life to have been associated.

The grammatical system of Gesenius has, from causes which can readily be explained, had a predominance in this country to which it is not justly entitled. The grammar of Prof. Stuart, for a long time the text-book in most common use, was substantially a reproduction of that of Gesenius. Nordheimer was an adherent of the same system in its essential features, though he illustrated it with wonderful clearness and philosophical tact. And finally, the smaller grammar of Gesenius became current in the excellent translation of Prof. Conant. Now, while Gesenius is unquestionably the prince of Hebrew lexicographers, Ewald is as certainly entitled to



the precedence among grammarians; and the latter cannot be ignored by him who would appreciate correctly the existing state of oriental learning.

The present work is mainly based upon the three leading grammars of Gesenius, Ewald, and Nordheimer, and the attempt has been made to combine whatever is valuable in each. For the sake of a more complete survey of the history of opinion, the grammars of R. Chayug, R. Kimchi, Reuchlin, Buxtorf, Schultens, Simonis, Robertson, Lee, Stier, Hupfeld, Freytag, Nägelsbach, and Stuart, besides others of less consequence from Jewish or Christian sources, have also been consulted to a greater or less extent. The author has not, however, contented himself with an indolent compilation; but, while availing himself freely of the labours of his predecessors, he has sought to maintain an independent position by investigating the whole subject freshly and thoroughly for himself. His design in the following pages has been to reflect the phenomena of the language precisely as they are exhibited in the Hebrew Bible; and it is believed that this is more exactly accomplished than it has been in any preceding grammar. The rule was adopted at the outset, and rigorously adhered to, that no supposititious forms should be admitted, that no example should be alleged which is not found in actual use, that no statement should be made and no rule given the evidence of which had not personally been subjected to careful scrutiny. Thus, for example, before treating of any class of verbs, perfect or imperfect, every verb of that description in the language was separately traced through all its forms as shown by a concordance; the facts were thus absolutely ascertained in the first instance before a single paradigm was prepared or a word of explanation written.

Some may be disposed, at first, to look suspiciously upon the triple division of the Hebrew vowels, adopted

from Ewald, as an innovation: further reflection, however, will show that it is the only division consistent with accuracy, and it is really more ancient than the one which commonly prevails.

The importance of the accent, especially to the proper understanding of the vowels of a word and the laws of vowel-changes, is such that the example of Ewald has been followed in constantly marking its position by an appropriate sign. He uses a Methegh for this purpose, which is objectionable on account of the liability to error and confusion when the same sign is used for distinct purposes. The use of any one of the many Hebrew accents would also be liable to objection, since they not only indicate the tone-syllable, but have besides a conjunctive or disjunctive force, which it would be out of place to suggest. Accordingly, a special symbol has been employed, analogous to that which is in use in our own and other languages, thus קטל *kātal'*.

The remarks upon the consecution of poetic accents were in type before the appearance of the able discussion of that subject by Baer, in an appendix to the Commentary of Delitzsch upon the Psalms. The rules of Baer, however, depend for their justification upon the assumption of the accurate accentuation of his own recent edition of the Hebrew Psalter, which departs in numerous instances from the current editions as they do in fact from one another. Inasmuch as this is a question which can only be settled by manuscripts that are not accessible in this country, it seems best to wait until it has been tested and pronounced upon by those who are capable of doing so. What has here been written on that subject, has accordingly been suffered to remain, imperfect and unsatisfactory as it is.

The laws which regulate the formation of nouns have been derived from Ewald, with a few modifications chiefly tending to simplify them.

The declensions of nouns, as made out by Gesenius, have the merit of affording a convenient and tolerably complete classification of their forms and of the changes to which each is liable. Nordheimer abandoned them for a method of his own, in which he aimed at greater simplicity, but in reality rendered the subject more perplexed. The system of Ewald is complicated with the derivation and formation of nouns, from which their subsequent modifications are quite distinct. The fact is, however, that there are no declensions, properly speaking, in Hebrew; and the attempt to foist upon the language what is alien to its nature, embarrasses the subject instead of relieving it. A few general rules respecting the vowel-changes, which are liable to occur in different kinds of syllables, solve the whole mystery, and are all that the case requires or even admits.

In the syntax the aim has been to develop not so much what is common to the Hebrew with other languages, as what is characteristic and distinctive of the former, those points being particularly dwelt upon which are of chief importance to the interpreter.

In the entire work special reference has been had to the wants of theological students. The author has endeavoured to make it at once elementary and thorough, so that it might both serve as a manual for beginners and yet possess all that completeness which is demanded by riper scholars. The parts of most immediate importance to those commencing the study of the language are distinguished by being printed in large type.

# CONTENTS.

---

## PART I.—ORTHOGRAPHY.

Divisions of Grammar, §1.

### ORTHOGRAPHIC SYMBOLS.

THE LETTERS.—Alphabet, §2; Sounds, §3; Double forms, §4; Names, §5; Order, §6; Classification, §7; Words never divided, §8; Abbreviations and Signs of Number, §9.

THE VOWELS.—Masoretic Points, §10; Vowel Letters, §11; Signs for the Vowels, §12; Mutual Relation of this twofold Notation, §§13, 14; Pure and Diphthongal Vowels, §15.

Sh'va, silent and vocal, simple and compound, §16.

Patahh Furtive, §17.

Syllables, §18.

*Ambiguous Signs.*—Hhirik, Shurek, and Kibbutz, §19.1; Kamets and Kamets-Hhatuph, §19.2; Silent and Vocal Sh'va, §20.

POINTS AFFECTING CONSONANTS:—Daghesh-lene, §§21, 22.

Daghesh-forte, §23; different kinds, §24; omission of, §25.

Mappik, §26.

Raphe, §27.

POINTS ATTACHED TO WORDS.—Accents, their design, §28; forms and classes, §29; like forms distinguished, §30; poetic accents, §31; position as determined by the character of the syllables, §32.1; in uninflected words, §32.2.3; with affixes, suffixes and prefixes, §33; use in distinguishing words, §34; shifted in special cases, §35.

*Consecution of the Accents in Prose.*—Clauses and their subdivisions, §36; tabular view, §37; explanation of the table, §38; adaptation of the trains of accents to sentences, §39.

*Poetic Consecution.*—Clauses and their subdivisions, §40; tabular view and explanation, §41; adaptation of the trains of accents to sentences, §42.

Makkeph, §43.

Methegh, its form and position, §44; special rules, §45; K'ri and K'thibh, meaning of the terms, §46; constant K'ris not noted in the margin, §47; their design and value, §48.

Accuracy of the points, §49.

#### ORTHOGRAPHIC CHANGES.

Significant mutations belong to the domain of the lexicon, §§50, 51; euphonic mutations to the domain of grammar, §52.

MUTATIONS OF CONSONANTS at the beginning of syllables, §53; at the close of syllables, §54; at the end of words, §55; special rules, §56.

CHANGES OF CONSONANTS TO VOWELS in reduplicated syllables and letters and in quiescents, §57.

MUTATIONS OF VOWELS, significant and euphonic, §58; due to syllabic changes, §59; to contiguous gutturals, §60; to concurrent consonants, §61; concurring vowels, §62; proximity of vowels, §63; the accent, §64; pause accents, §65; shortening or lengthening of words, §66.

---

#### PART II.—ETYMOLOGY.

ROOTS OF WORDS.—Design of Etymology, three stages in the growth of words, §67; pronominal and verbal roots, §68; formation and inflection of words by external and internal changes, §69; parts of speech, §70.

PRONOUNS personal, §71; pronominal suffixes, §72; demonstrative, §73; relative, §74; interrogative and indefinite, §75.

VERBS, the species and their signification, §§76–80.

PERFECT VERBS, §81; formation of the species, §§82, 83; their inflection, §§84, 85. 1; paradigm of *בָּנִי*, §85. 2.

*Remarks on the Perfect Verbs.*—Kal preterite, §86; Infinitive, §87; Future, §88; Imperative, §89; Participles, §90; Niphal, §91; Piel, §92; Pual, §93; Hiphil, §94; Hophal, §95; Hithpael, §96.

Paragogic and Apocopated Future, §97; and Imperative, §98.

Vav Conversive with the Future, §99; with the Preterite, §100.

Verbs with suffixes, §§101, 102; paradigm, §103; Remarks on the Perfect Verbs with suffixes, Preterite, §104; Future, §105; Infinitive and Imperative, §106.

IMPERFECT VERBS, classified, §107.

Pe Guttural Verbs, their peculiarities, §§108, 109; paradigm, §110; Remarks, §§111–115.

- Ayin Guttural Verbs, their peculiarities, § 116; paradigm, § 117; Remarks, §§ 118–122.
- Lamedh Guttural Verbs, their peculiarities, § 123; paradigm, § 124; Remarks, §§ 125–128.
- Pe Nun Verbs, their peculiarities, § 129; paradigm, § 130; Remarks, §§ 131, 132.
- Ayin Doubled Verbs, their peculiarities, §§ 133–137; paradigm, § 138; Remarks, §§ 139–142.
- Pe Yodh Verbs, their peculiarities, §§ 143–145; paradigm, § 146; Remarks, §§ 147–151.
- Ayin Vav and Ayin Yodh Verbs, their peculiarities, §§ 152–154; paradigm, § 155; Remarks, §§ 156–161.
- Lamedh Aleph Verbs, their peculiarities, § 162; paradigm, § 163; Remarks, §§ 164–167.
- Lamedh He Verbs, their peculiarities, §§ 168, 169; paradigm, § 170; shortened future and imperative, § 171; Remarks, §§ 172–177.
- Doubly Imperfect Verbs, § 178.
- Defective Verbs, § 179.
- Quadriliteral Verbs, § 180.
- NOUNS, their formation, § 181; Class I. §§ 182–186; Class II. §§ 187, 188; Class III. §§ 189–192; Class IV. §§ 193, 194; Multiliterals, § 195.
- Gender and Number.*—Feminine endings, § 196; anomalies in the use of, § 197; employment in the formation of words, § 198; plural endings, § 199; anomalies, § 200; nouns confined to one number, § 201; Dual ending, § 202; usage of the dual, § 203; changes consequent upon affixing the endings for gender and number, §§ 206–211.
- The Construct State, its meaning and formation, §§ 212–216.
- Declension of Nouns, paradigm, § 217.
- Paragogic Vowels added to Nouns, §§ 218, 219.
- Nouns with suffixes, §§ 220, 221; paradigm, § 222.
- NUMERALS.—Cardinal numbers, §§ 223–226; Ordinals, etc., § 227.
- PREFIXED PARTICLES, § 228; the Article, § 229: the Interrogative, § 230; Inseparable prepositions, §§ 231–233; Vav Conjunctive, § 234.
- SEPARATE PARTICLES.—Adverbs, § 235; with suffixes, § 236; Prepositions, § 237; with suffixes, § 238; Conjunctions, § 239; Interjections, § 240.

---

### PART III.—SYNTAX.

- Office of Syntax, § 241. 1; Elements of the sentence, § 241. 2.
- THE SUBJECT, a noun or pronoun, § 242; when omitted, § 243; its extension, § 244.
- The Article, when used, § 245; nouns definite without it, § 246; omitted in poetry, § 247; indefinite nouns, § 248.
- Adjectives and Demonstratives qualifying a noun, § 249.

*Numerals*.—Cardinal numbers, §§ 250, 251; Ordinals, etc., § 252.

Apposition, § 253.

The Construct state and Suffixes, §§ 254–256; resolved by the preposition ה, § 257.

THE PREDICATE, Copula, § 258; Nouns, adjectives, and demonstratives, § 259.

Comparison of adjectives, § 260.

*Verbs*.—Hebrew conception of time, § 261; the primary tenses: use of the preterite, § 262; the future, § 263; paragogic and apocopated future, § 264; the secondary tenses, § 265; participles, § 266; Infinitive, §§ 267–269.

*Object of Verbs*.—The direct object of transitive verbs, § 270; transitive construction of intransitive verbs, § 271; indirect object of verbs, § 272; verbs with more than one object, § 273.

Adverbs and adverbial expressions, § 274.

Neglect of agreement, § 275; compound subject, § 276; nouns in the construct, § 277; dual nouns, § 278; changes of person, § 279.

Repetition of nouns, § 280; pronouns, § 281; verbs, § 282.

INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES, §§ 283, 284.

COMPOUND SENTENCES.—Relative pronoun, § 285; poetic use of the demonstrative, § 286; conjunctions, § 287.

GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS,	.	.	.	.	.	.	page 315
INDEX I. Subjects,	.	.	.	.	.	.	" 323
INDEX II. Texts of Scripture,	.	.	.	.	.	.	" 331
INDEX III. Hebrew Words,	.	.	.	.	.	.	" 343
INDEX IV. Hebrew Grammatical Terms,	.	.	.	.	.	.	" 399

## PART FIRST.

### ORTHOGRAPHY.

§1. LANGUAGE is the communication of thought by means of spoken or written sounds. The utterance of a single thought constitutes a sentence. Each sentence is composed of words expressing individual conceptions or their relations. And words are made up of sounds produced by the organs of speech and represented by written signs. It is the province of grammar as the science of language to investigate these several elements. It hence consists of three parts. First, Orthography, which treats of the sounds employed and the mode of representing them. Second, Etymology, which treats of the different kinds of words, their formation, and the changes which they undergo. Third, Syntax, which treats of sentences, or the manner in which words are joined together to express ideas. The task of the Hebrew grammarian is to furnish a complete exhibition of the phenomena of this particular language, carefully digested and referred as far as practicable to their appropriate causes in the organs of speech and the operations of the mind.

### THE LETTERS.

§2. The Hebrew being no longer a spoken tongue, is only known as the language of books, and particularly of the Old Testament, which is the most interesting and important as well as the only pure monument of it. The first step



towards its investigation must accordingly be to ascertain the meaning of the symbols in which it is recorded. Then having learned its sounds, as they are thus represented, it will be possible to advance one step further, and inquire into the laws by which these are governed in their employment and mutations.

The symbols used in writing Hebrew are of two sorts, viz. letters (אותיות) and points (נקודים). The number of the letters is twenty-two; these are written from right to left, and are exclusively consonants. The following alphabetical table exhibits their forms, English equivalents, names, and numerical values, together with the corresponding forms of the Rabbinical character employed to a considerable extent in the commentaries and other writings of the modern Jews.

Order.	Forms and Equivalents.		Names.	Rabbinical Alphabet.	Numerical values.
1	א	—	אֵלֶּפֶת Áleph	א	1
2	ב	Bh, B	בֵּית Bēth	ב	2
3	ג	Gh, G	גִּימֵל Gī'-mel	ג	3
4	ד	Dh, D	דָּלֶת Dā'-leth	ד	4
5	ה	H	הֵא Hē	ה	5
6	ו	V	וָו Vāv	ו	6
7	ז	Z	זַיִן Záyin	ז	7
8	ח	Hh	חֵית Hhēth	ח	8
9	ט	T	טֵית Tēth	ט	9
10	י	Y	יּוֹד Yōdh	י	10
11	כ	Kh, K	כַּף Kaph	כ	20
12	ל	L	לָמֶד Lā'-medh	ל	30
13	מ	M	מֶם Mēm	מ	40
14	נ	N	נוּן Nūn	נ	50
15	ס	S	סָמֶךְ Sā'-mekh	ס	60
16	ע	—	עֵיִן Áyin	ע	70
17	פ	Ph, P	פֶּא Pē	פ	80
18	צ	Ts	צָדִי Tsā'-dhē	צ	90
19	ק	K	קוֹף Kōph	ק	100
20	ר	R	רֵישׁ Rēsh	ר	200
21	ש	Sh, S	שִׁין Shīn	ש	300
22	ת	Th, T	תָּו Tāv	ת	400

§3. There is always more or less difficulty in representing the sounds of one language by those of another. But this is in the case of the Hebrew greatly aggravated by its having been for ages a dead language, so that some of its

sounds cannot now be accurately determined, and also by its belonging to a different family or group of tongues from our own, possessing sounds entirely foreign to the English, for which it consequently affords no equivalent, and which are in fact incapable of being pronounced by our organs. The equivalents of the foregoing table are not therefore to be regarded as in every instance exact representations of the proper powers of the letters. They are simply approximations sufficiently near the truth for every practical purpose, the best which can now be proposed, and sanctioned by tradition and the conventional usage of the best Hebraists.

1. It will be observed that a double pronunciation has been assigned to seven of the letters. A native Hebrew would readily decide without assistance which of these was to be adopted in any given case, just as we are sensible of no inconvenience from the various sounds of the English letters which are so embarrassing to foreigners learning our language. The ambiguity is in every case removed, however, by the addition of a dot or point indicating which sound they are to receive. Thus ב with a point in its bosom has the sound of *b*, ב unpointed that of the corresponding *v*, or as it is commonly represented for the sake of uniformity in notation, *bh*; ג is pronounced as *g*, ג unpointed had an aspirated sound which may accordingly be represented by *gh*, but as it is difficult to produce it, or even to determine with exactness what it was, and as there is no corresponding sound in English, the aspiration is mostly neglected, and the letter, whether pointed or not, sounded indifferently as *g*; ד is *d*, ד unpointed is the aspirate *dh*, equivalent to *th* in *the*; כ is *k*, כ unpointed its aspirate *kh*, perhaps resembling the German *ch* in *ich*, though its aspiration, like that of ג, is commonly neglected in modern reading; פ is *p*, פ unpointed is *ph* or *f*; ט is *t*, ט unpointed *th* in *thin*. The letter ש with a dot over its right arm is pronounced like *sh*, and called *Shîn*; ש with a dot over its left arm is called *Sîn*, and pronounced like *s*, no attempt being made in modern

usage to discriminate between its sound and that of ט Samekh. Although there may anciently have been a distinction between them, this can no longer be defined nor even positively asserted; it has therefore been thought unnecessary to preserve the individuality of these letters in the notation, and both of them will accordingly be represented by *s*.

*a.* The double sound of the first six of the letters just named is purely euphonic, and has no effect whatever upon the meaning of the words in which they stand. The case of ש is different. Its primary sound was that of *sh*, as is evident from the contrast in Judg. 12 : 6 of שִׁבְּלֵת *shibboleth* with סִבְּלֵת *sibboleth*. In certain words, however, and sometimes for the sake of creating a distinction between different words of like orthography, it received the sound of *s*, thus almost assuming the character of a distinct letter, e. g. שָׁבַר *to break*, שָׁבַר *to hope*. That Sin and Samekh were distinguishable to the ear, appears probable from the fact that there are words of separate significations which differ only in the use of one or the other of these letters, and in which they are never interchanged, e. g. שָׁבַל *to be bereaved*, שָׁבַל *to be wise*, סָבַל *to be foolish*; שָׁבַר *to be drunken*, שָׁבַר *to hire*, סָבַר *to shut up*; שָׁר *to look*, שָׁר *to rule*, סָר *to turn back*; שָׁפָה *a lip*, סָפָה *to destroy*. The close affinity between the sounds which they represent is, however, shown by the fact that ס is in a few instances written for ש, e. g. נֶסֶח Ps. 4 : 7 from נֶשֶׁח, סִבְּלֵת Eccles. 1 : 17 for שִׁבְּלֵת. The original identity of ש and ש is apparent from the etymological connection between שָׁאָר *leaven* and מִשְׁאָרָה *a vessel in which bread is leavened*; שָׁעַר *to shudder*, שָׁעָרָה *horrible, causing a shudder*. In Arabic the division of single letters into two distinguished by diacritical points is carried to a much greater length, the alphabet of that language being by this means enlarged from twenty-two to twenty-eight letters

2. In their original power ט *t* differed from ת *t*, and כ *k* from ק *k*, for these letters are not confused nor liable to interchange, and the distinction is preserved to this day in the cognate Arabic; yet it is not easy to state intelligibly wherein the difference consisted. They are currently pronounced precisely alike.

3. The letter ר has a stronger sound than ה the simple *h*, and is accordingly represented by *hh*; ר is represented by *r*, although it had some peculiarity of sound which we cannot at this day attempt to reproduce, by which it was allied to the gutturals.

4. For two letters,  $\aleph$  and  $\eth$ , no equivalent has been given in the table, and they are commonly altogether neglected in pronunciation.  $\aleph$  is the weakest of the letters, and was probably always inaudible. It stands for the slight and involuntary emission of breath necessary to the utterance of a vowel unattended by a more distinct consonant sound. It therefore merely serves to mark the beginning or the close of the syllable of which it is a part, while to the ear it is entirely lost in the accompanying or preceding vowel. Its power has been likened to that of the smooth breathing (') of the Greeks or the English silent *h* in *hour*. On the other hand  $\eth$  had a deep guttural sound which was always heard, but like that of the corresponding letter among the Arabs is very difficult of utterance by occidental organs; consequently no attempt is made to reproduce it. In the Septuagint it is sometimes represented by  $\gamma$ , sometimes by the rough and sometimes by the smooth breathing; thus  $\aleph\eth\aleph$  *Γόμορρά*,  $\eth\aleph$  *Ἡλί*,  $\aleph\eth\aleph$  *Ἀμαλή*. Some of the modern Jews give it the sound of *ng* or of the French *gn* in *campagne*, either wherever it occurs or only at the end of words, e. g.  $\eth\aleph\aleph$  *Sh'mang*,  $\eth\aleph$  *gnāmōdh*.

§4. The forms of the letters exhibited in the preceding table, though found without important variation in all existing manuscripts, are not the original ones. An older character is preserved upon the Jewish coins struck in the age of the Maccabees, which bears a considerable resemblance to the Samaritan and still more to the Phenician. Some of the steps in the transition from one to the other can still be traced upon extant monuments. There was first a cursive tendency, disposing to unite the different letters of the same word, which is the established practice in Syriac and Arabic. This was followed by a predominance of the calligraphic principle, which again separated the letters and reduced them to their present rectangular forms and nearly uniform size. The cursive stage has, however, left its traces upon the five letters

which appear in the table with double forms ; צ פ נ מ כ when standing at the beginning or in the middle of words terminate in a bottom horizontal stroke, which is the remnant of the connecting link with the following letter ; at the end of words no such link was needed, and the letter was continued vertically downward in a sort of terminal flourish thus, ך ם ן ך, or closed up by joining its last with its initial stroke, thus ם.

a. The few instances in which final letters are found in the middle of words, as לְבַרְבֵּה Isa. 9 : 6, or their ordinary forms at the end, as נֶהְם Neh. 2 : 13, מִן Job 38 : 1, are probably due to the inadvertence of early transcribers which has been faithfully perpetuated since, or if intentional they may have had a connection now unknown with the enumeration of letters or the signification of words. The same may be said of letters larger than usual, as וְכִנָּה Ps. 80 : 16, or smaller, as בְּהַבְרָאִים Gen. 2 : 4, or above the line, as מְעִיר Ps. 80 : 14, or inverted, as בְּסִטֵּעַ Num. 10 : 35, (in manuscripts and the older editions, e. g. that of Stephanus in 1541), or with extraordinary points, as וַיִּשְׁקָחוּ Gen. 33 : 4, לֹלֵאֵ Ps. 27 : 13, in all which the Rabbins find concealed meanings of the most fanciful and absurd character. Thus in their opinion the suspended נ in מִנְשֵׁה Judg. 18 : 30 suggests that the idolaters described were descended from Moses but had the character of Manasseh. In גְּהֹרֶן Lev. 11 : 42 the Vav, which is of unusual size, is the middle letter of the Pentateuch ; וּבִרְלִיָּה Gen. 16 : 5 with an extraordinary point over the second Yodh, is the only instance in which the word is written with that letter ; the large letters in Deut. 6 : 4 emphasize the capital article of the Jewish faith. All such anomalous forms or marks, with the conceits of the Rabbins respecting them, are reviewed in detail in Buxtorf's Tiberias, pp. 152 etc.

§5. All the names of the letters were probably significant at first, although the meanings of some of them are now doubtful or obscure. It is commonly supposed that these describe the objects to which their forms originally bore a rude resemblance. If this be so, however, the mutations which they have since undergone are such, that the relation is no longer traceable, unless it be faintly in a few. The power of the letter is in every instance the initial sound of its name.

a. The opinion advocated by Schultens, *Fundamenta Ling. Heb.* p. 10, that the invention of the letters was long anterior to that of their names, and that the latter was a pedagogical expedient to facilitate the learning of the letters by associating their forms and sounds with familiar objects, has met with little favour and possesses little intrinsic probability. An interest-

ing corroboration of the antiquity of these names is found in their preservation in the Greek alphabet, though destitute of meaning in that language, the Greeks having borrowed their letters at an early period from the Phœnicians, and hence the appended *a* of "Αλφα, etc., which points to the Aramaeic form אָפֶּא.

b. The Semitic derivation of the names proves incontestably that the alphabet had its origin among a people speaking a language kindred to the Hebrew. Their most probable meanings, so far as they are still explicable, are as follows, viz: Aleph, *an ox*; Beth, *a house*; Gimel, *a camel*; Daleth, *a door*; He, doubtful, possibly *a window*; Vav, *a hook*; Zayin, *a weapon*; Hheth, probably *a fence*; Teth, probably *a snake*; Yodh, *a hand*; Kaph, *the palm of the hand*; Lamedh, *an ox-goad*; Mem, *water*; Nun, *a fish*; Samekh, *a prop*; Ayin, *an eye*; Pe, *a mouth*; Tsadhe, *a fish-hook* or *a hunter's dart*; Koph, perhaps *the back of the head*; Resh, *a head*; Shin, *a tooth*; Tav, *a cross mark*.

§6. The order of the letters appears to be entirely arbitrary, though it has been remarked that the three middle mutes א ב ג succeed each other, as in like manner the three liquids ח ט י. The juxtaposition of a few of the letters may perhaps be owing to the kindred signification of their names, e. g. Yodh and Kaph *the hand*, Mem *water* and Nun *a fish*, Resh *the head* and Shin *a tooth*. The antiquity of the existing arrangement of the alphabet is shown, 1. by psalms and other portions of the Old Testament in which successive clauses or verses begin with the letters disposed in regular order, viz. Ps. 25 (א omitted), 34, 37 (alternate verses, א omitted), 111 (every clause), 112 (every clause), 119 (each letter eight times), 145 (א omitted), Prov. 31:10–31, Lam. ch. 1, 2, 3 (each letter three times), 4. In the first chapter of Lamentations the order is exactly preserved, but in the remaining three chapters א and ב are transposed. 2. By the correspondence of the Greek and Roman alphabets, which have sprung from the same origin with the Hebrew.

a. The most ingenious attempt to discover a regular structure in the Hebrew alphabet is that of Lepsius, in an essay upon this subject published in 1836. Omitting the sibilants and Resh, he finds the following triple correspondence of a breathing, succeeded by the same three mutes carried through each of the three orders, the second rank being enlarged by the addition of the liquids.



	Breathings.	Mutes.		Liquids.
Middle	א	ב ג ד		
Smooth	ה	ו ז ח ט	(כ)	נ מ ל
Rough	ע	פ ק ת		

Curious as this result certainly is, it must be confessed that the alleged correspondence is in part imaginary, and the method by which it is reached is too arbitrary to warrant the conclusion that this scheme was really in the mind of the author of the alphabet, much less to sustain the further speculations built upon it, reducing the original number and modifying the powers of the letters.

b. It is curious to see how, in the adaptation of the alphabet to different languages, the sounds of the letters have been modified, needless ones dropped, and others found necessary added at the end, without disturbing the arrangement of the original stock. Thus the Greeks dropped ו and ק, only retaining them as numerical signs, while the Roman alphabet has F and Q; on the other hand the Romans found ט and ס superfluous, while the Greeks made of them Ϟ and ξ; ג and ז, in Greek γ and ζ, become in Latin C and G, while ח, in Latin H, is in Greek converted like the rest of the gutturals into a vowel η.

§ 7. The letters may be variously divided :

1. First, with respect to the organs by which they are pronounced.

Gutturals	א	ה	ח	ע
Palatals	ג	י	כ	ק
Linguals	ד	ט	ל	נ ת
Dentals	ז	ס	צ	ש
Labials	ב	ו	מ	פ

ך has been differently classed, but as its peculiarities are those of the gutturals, it is usually reckoned with them.

2. Secondly, according to their respective strength, into three classes, which may be denominated weak, medium, and strong. The strong consonants offer the greatest resistance to change, and are capable of entering into any combinations which the formation or inflection of words may require. The weak have not this capacity, but when analogy would bring them into combinations foreign to their nature, they are either



liable to mutation themselves or occasion changes in the rest of the word. Those of medium strength have neither the absolute stability of the former nor the feeble and fluctuating character of the latter.

Weak,	{	א	ה	ו	י	Vowel-Letters,
		א	ה	ע	ק	
Medium,	{	ל	מ	נ	ר	Liquids,
		ז	ס	צ	ש	
Strong,	{	ב	פ	ק	ט	} Aspirates and Mutes.
		ג	כ			
		ד	ת			

The special characteristics of these several classes and the influence which they exert upon the constitution of words will be considered hereafter. It is sufficient to remark here that the vowel-letters are so called because they sometimes represent not consonant but vowel-sounds.

*a.* It will be observed that while the *p*, *k*, and *t*-mutes agree in having smooth פ כ ת and middle forms פ ג ת, which may be either aspirated or unaspirated, the two last have each an additional representative ק ט which is lacking to the first. This, coupled with the fact that two of the alphabetic Psalms, Ps. 25, 34, repeat פ as the initial of the closing verse, has given rise to the conjecture that the missing *p* mute was supplied by this letter, having a double sound and a double place in the alphabet. In curious coincidence with this ingenious but unsustained hypothesis, the Ethiopic alphabet has an additional *p*, and the Greek and Roman alphabets agree one step and only one beyond the letter T, viz. in adding next a labial, which in Greek is divided into *υ* and *φ*, and in Latin into U and V, as י into I and J.

3. Thirdly, The letters may be divided, with respect to their function in the formation of words, into radicals and serviles. The former, which comprise just one half of the alphabet, are never employed except in the roots or radical portions of words. The latter may also enter into the constitution of roots, but they are likewise put to the less independent use of the formation of derivatives and inflections, of prefixes and suffixes. The serviles are embraced in the

memorial words **אֵתָן מֹשֶׁה וְכָלֵב** (Ethan Moses and Caleb); of these, besides other uses, **אֵתָן** are prefixed to form the future of verbs, and the remainder are prefixed as particles to nouns. The letters **הָאֶמְתִּיר** are used in the formation of nouns from their roots. The only exception to the division now stated is the substitution of **ט** for servile **ת** in a certain class of cases, as explained § 54. 4.

a. Kimchi in his *Mikhlol* (מִכְלֹל) fol. 46, gives several additional anagrams of the serviles made out by different grammarians as aids to the memory, e. g. **בִּינָה שְׂמֵלֵאכֶּהוּ** *for his work is understanding*; **אֲנִי שְׁלֵמָה** *I Solomon am writing*; **כִּוְהַב אַךְ הַבְנָה** *only build thou my peace*; **מֹשֶׁה כָּתַב אֵלֵינוּ** *like a branch of the father of multitude*; **שָׂאֵל הוֹן מִכְתָּבִי** *Moses has written to us. To which Nordheimer has added שָׂאֵל הוֹן מִכְתָּבִי* *consult the riches of my book*.

§ 8. In Hebrew writing and printing, words are never divided. Hence various expedients are resorted to upon occasion, in manuscripts and old printed editions, to fill out the lines, such as giving a broad form to certain letters, **הֵא**, **לֵא**, occupying the vacant space with some letter, as **ק**, repeated as often as may be necessary, or with the first letters of the next word, which were not, however, accounted part of the text, as they were left without vowels, and the word was written in full at the beginning of the following line. The same end is accomplished more neatly in modern printing by judicious spacing.

§ 9. 1. The later Jews make frequent use of abbreviations. There are none, however, in the text of the Hebrew Bible; such as are found in the margin are explained in a special lexicon at the back of the editions in most common use, e. g. **וְגוֹמַר** *for et completio = etc.*

2. The numerical employment of the letters, common to the Hebrews with the Greeks, is indicated in the table of the alphabet. The hundreds from 500 to 900 are represented either by the five final letters or by the combination of **ת** with the letters immediately preceding; thus **הק** or **ך** 500, **תר** or **ם** 600, **הש** or **ן** 700, **תת** or **ף** 800, **תתק** or **ץ** 900. Thou-

sands are represented by units with two dots placed over them, thus  $\aleph$  1000, etc. Compound numbers are formed by joining the appropriate units to the tens and hundreds, thus  $\text{הכ"א}$  421. Fifteen is, however, made not by  $\text{יה}$ , which are the initial letters of the divine name Jehovah,  $\text{יהוה}$ , but by  $\text{טו}$  9+6.

This use of the letters is found in the accessories of the Hebrew text, e. g. in the numeration of the chapters and verses, and in the Masoretic notes, but not in the text itself. Whether these or any other signs of number were ever employed by the original writers of Scripture, or by the scribes in copying it, may be a doubtful matter. It has been ingeniously conjectured, and with a show of plausibility, that some of the discrepancies of numbers in the Old Testament may be accounted for by assuming the existence of such a system of symbols, in which errors might more easily arise than in fully written words.

### THE VOWELS.

§ 10. The letters now explained constitute the body of the Hebrew text. These are all that belonged to it in its original form, and so long as the language was a living one nothing more was necessary, for the reader could mentally supply the deficiencies of the notation from his familiarity with his native tongue. But when Hebrew ceased to be spoken the case was different; the knowledge of the true pronunciation could no longer be presumed, and difficulties would arise from the ambiguity of individual words and their doubtful relation to one another. It is the design of the Masoretic points ( $\text{מסורה}$  *tradition*) to remedy or obviate these inconveniences by supplying what was lacking in this mode of writing. The authors of this system did not venture to make any change in the letters of the sacred text. The signs which they introduced were entirely supplementary, consisting of dots and marks about the text fixing its true pronun-

ciation and auxiliary to its proper interpretation. This has been done with the utmost nicety and minuteness, and with such evident accuracy and care as to make them reliable and efficient if not indispensable helps. These points or signs are of three kinds, 1. those representing the vowels, 2. those affecting the consonants, 3. those attached to words.

a. As illustrations of the ambiguity both as to sound and sense of individual words, when written by the letters only, it may be stated that דָּבַר is in Gen. 12: 4 דָּבַר *he spake*, in Ex. 6: 29 דָּבַר *speaking*, in Prov. 25: 11 דָּבַר *spoken*, in Gen. 37: 14 דָּבַר *word*, in 1 Kin. 6: 16 דָּבַר *the oracle* or most holy place of the temple, in Ex. 9: 3 דָּבַר *pestilence*. So וַיִּשָּׂק is in Gen. 29: 10 וַיִּשָּׂק *and he watered*, and in the next verse וַיִּשָּׂק *and he kissed*; וַיָּבֵא occurs twice in Gen. 29: 23, the first time it is וַיָּבֵא *and he brought*, the second וַיָּבֵא *and he came*; וַיִּשְׁבְּתֵם is in Jer. 32: 37 וַיִּשְׁבְּתֵם *and I will bring them again*, and then וַיִּשְׁבְּתֵם *and I will cause them to dwell*; שָׁמַיִם is in Gen. 14: 19 שָׁמַיִם *heaven*, and in Isa. 5: 20 שָׁמַיִם *putting*. This ambiguity is, however, in most cases removed by the connection in which the words are found, so that there is little practical difficulty for one who is well acquainted with the language. Modern Hebrew is commonly written and read without the points: and the same is true of its kindred tongues the Syriac and Arabic, though each of these has a system of points additional to the letters.

§ 11. 1. The alphabet, as has been seen, consisted exclusively of consonants, since these were regarded as a sufficiently exact representation of the syllables into which in Hebrew they invariably enter. And the omission of the vowels occasioned less embarrassment, because in the Semitic family of languages generally, unlike the Indo-European, they form no part, properly speaking, of the radical structure of the word, and consequently do not aid in expressing its essential meaning, but only its nicer shades and modifications. Still some notation of vowels was always necessary, and this was furnished in a scanty measure by the vowel-letters, or, as they are also called, quiescents, or *matres lectionis* (guides in reading). The weakest of the palatals י was taken as the representative of the vowels  $\bar{i}$  and  $\bar{e}$  of the same organ to which in sound it bears a close affinity; the weakest of the labials ו was in like manner made to represent its cognates  $\bar{u}$  and  $\bar{o}$ ; and the

two weak gutturals א and ה were written for the guttural vowel *ā*, as well as for the compound vowels *ē* and *ō* of which *α* is one of the elements. Letters were more rarely employed to represent short vowels; ה or י for *ē* is the most frequent case; others are exceptional.

a. Medial *ā* when written at all, as it very rarely is, is denoted by א, e. g. לַאֵט *lāt* Judg. 4: 21, דָּאֵג *dāg* Neh. 13: 16 K'thibh, קָאֵם *kām* Hos. 10: 14, זָאֵזֵל *zāzēl* Lev. 16: 8, רָאֵשׁ *rāsh* Prov. 10: 4 and in a few other passages, sometimes for *rāmōth*, צָוָאר *tsavvār*, אֵמָסָאֵךְ Hos. 4: 6 if not an error in the text perhaps for *emāsāk*; final *ā*, which is much more frequently written, is denoted by ה, e. g. גָּלָה *gālā*, מַלְכָּה *malkā*, אַתָּה *attā*, rarely and only as an Aramæism by א, e. g. חֲגָא *hhoggā* Isa. 19: 17, קֹרְחָא *korhḥā* Ezek. 27: 31 K'thibh, גַּבְהָא *gābh'hā* Ezek. 31: 5 K'thibh. The writing of *ē* and *ī*, *ō* and *ū* is optional in the middle of words but necessary at the end, e. g. צִוְיָהִם or צִוְיָהִים *tsivvīthīm*, צִוְיָהִי *tsivvīthī*; שָׁבוּ or שֻׁבוּ *shūbhū*. In the former position י stands for the first pair of vowels, and ו for the second, e. g. מִינִיקוֹת *mēnīkōth*, נִסְגְּחוֹת *n'sūghōthī*; א for *ē* and *ō* so situated is rare and exceptional, e. g. רֵאֵשׁ *rēsh* Prov. 6: 11, 30: 8, and perhaps יָנְאֵל *yānēls* Eccles. 12: 5; זָאֵה *zōth*, פֹּרְאָה *pōrōth* Ezek. 31: 8, בִּיטְסֹתָו *bitstsōthāv* Ezek. 47: 11. At the end of words *ē* is commonly expressed by י, and *ō* by ו, though ה is frequently and א rarely employed for the same purpose, e. g. מַלְכֵי *malkhē*, מַלְכוֹ *malkō*; הֵיָה *h'ye*, פֶּרְעָה *parō*; לֹא *lō*. Final *ē* is represented by ה, medial *ē* if written at all by י, e. g. יֵהִיָּה *yih'ye*, תִּהְיֶנָּה or תִּהְיֶנָּה *tih'yenā*.







b. The employment of the vowel-letters in conformity with the scale just given, is further governed, (1.) By usage, which is in many words and forms almost or quite invariable; in others it fluctuates, thus *sōbhēbh* is commonly סָבַב or סֻבַּב, only once סָבִיב 2 Kin. 8: 21; *ya<sup>a</sup>kōbh* is יַעֲקֹב except in Jer. 33: 26 where it is יַעֲקֹב; *thēāse* is תַּעֲשֶׂה, but in Ex. 25: 31 תַּעֲשֶׂה; *ēthām* according to the analogy of similar grammatical forms would be אֵתָם, but in Ps. 19: 14 it is אֵיהֶם; *hēmīr* is in Jer. 2: 11 written in both the usual and an unusual way, הִמְיָר and הִמְיָר; *m'lākhīm* is מַלְכִּים except in 2 Sam. 11: 1, where it is מַלְאֲכִים; *g'bhūlōth* is in Deut. 32: 8 גְּבוּלָה, in Isa. 10: 13 גְּבוּלָה, in Ps. 74: 17 גְּבוּלָה; *lō* meaning *not* is לֹא, meaning *to him* is לוֹ, though these are occasionally interchanged; *zō* is written both זֶה and זוֹ; and פֶּה *pō*, פִּי and פֹּא. (2.) The indisposition to multiply the vowel-letters unduly in the same word, e. g. *lō<sup>a</sup>h* אֱלֹהֵה, *lōhīm* אֱלֹהִים; *nāthūn* נָתַן, *n'thūnīm* נָתַנִּים or נָתַנִּים. (3.) The increased tendency to their employment in the later books of the Bible, e. g. כֹּהֵה *kō<sup>a</sup>hh* Dan. 11: 6, always elsewhere כֹּה; קֹדֶשׁ *kōdhesh* Dan. 11: 30, for קֹדֶשׁ; דָּוִיד *dāvīdh* in the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Zechariah, elsewhere דָּוִד. This must, however, be taken with considerable abatement, as is shown by such examples as *addīrīm* אֲדִירִים Ex. 15: 10, אֲדִירִים Ezek. 32: 18.

It is to be observed that those cases in which א is used to record vowels must be carefully distinguished from those in which it properly




belongs to the consonantal structure of the word, though from its weakness it may have lost its sound, as מצא *mātsā*, ראשון *rāshōn*. § 57, 2.

2. When used to represent the Hebrew vowels, *ā* is sounded as in *father*, *ǎ* as in *fat*, *ē* as in *there*, *ě* as in *met*, *ī* as in *machine*, *ĭ* as in *pin*, *ō* as in *note*, *ö* as in *not*, *ū* as in *rule*, and *ŭ* as in *full*. The quantity will be marked when the vowels are long, but not when they are short.

§ 12. There are nine points or masoretic signs representing vowels (תנועות *motions*, viz., by which consonants are moved or pronounced); of these three are long, three short, and three doubtful. They are shown in the following table, the horizontal stroke indicating their position with reference to the letters of the text.

<i>Long Vowels.</i>			<i>Short Vowels.</i>		
קָמֶץ	Kā'-mets	<i>ā</i> 	פָּתַח	Pát-tahh	<i>ǎ</i> 
צֶרֶךְ	Tsē'-rē	<i>ē</i> 	סֶגוּל	Se'-ghōl	<i>ě</i> 
חֹלֶם	Hhō'-lem	<i>ō</i> 	קָמֶץ חֹטֵף	Kā'-mets Hhā-tūph'	<i>ö</i> 

*Doubtful Vowels.*

חֵירֶק	Hhī'-rik		} <i>ī</i> or <i>ĭ</i>
שׁוּרֶק	Shū'-rek		
קִבּוּץ	Kīb'-buts		

All these vowel-points are written under the letter after which they are pronounced except two, viz., Hholem and Shurek. Hholem is placed over the left edge of the letter to which it belongs, and is thus distinguished from the accent R'bhī<sup>a</sup>, which is a dot over its centre. When followed by ם or preceded by ם it coincides with the diacritical point over the letter, e. g. מֹשֶׁה *mōshe*, שֹׁנֵה *sōnē*; when it follows ם or precedes ם it is written over its opposite arm,



e. g. שֹׁמֶר *shōmēr*, תִּרְפֹּס *tirpōs*. Its presence in these cases must accordingly be determined by the circumstances. If preceded by a letter without a vowel-sign, שְׁ will be *ōs* and תְּ *ōs*; if it have itself no vowel-sign, שׁ will be *sō* and תּ *shō*, except at the end of words. Shurek is a dot in the bosom of the letter Vav, thus וּ. It will be observed that there is a double notation of the vowel *u*. When there is a וּ in the text this vowel, whether long or short, is indicated by a single dot within it, and called Shurek; in the absence of וּ it is indicated by three dots placed obliquely beneath the letter to which it belongs, and called Kibbutz.

a. The division of the vowels given above differs from the common one into five long and five short, according to which Hhirik is counted as two, viz., Hhirik magnum וּ. = *ī*, and Hhirik parvum וְ = *ī*; and Shurek is reckoned a distinct vowel from Kibbutz, the former being *ū* and the latter *ũ*. To this there are two objections. (1.) It confuses the masoretic signs with the letters of the text, as though they were coeval with them and formed part of the same primitive mode of writing, instead of being quite distinct in origin and character. The masoretic vowel-sign is not וּ. but וְ. The punctuators never introduced the letter וּ into the text; they found it already written precisely where it is at present, and all that they did was to add the point. And instead of using two signs for *i*, as they had done in the case of *a*, *e*, and *o*, they used but one, viz., a dot beneath the letter, whether *i* was long or short. The confusion of things thus separate in their nature was pardonable at a time when the points were supposed to be an original constituent of the sacred text, but not now when their more recent origin is universally admitted. (2.) It is inaccurate. The distinction between וּ. and וְ, וּ and וְ, is not one of quantity, for *ī* and *ū* are expressed indifferently with or without Yodh and Vav.

Gesenius, in his *Lehrgebäude*, while he retains the division of the vowels into five long and five short, admits that it is erroneous and calculated to mislead; and it has been discarded by Rödiger in the latest editions of his smaller grammar. That which was proposed by Gesenius, however, as a substitute, is perplexed and obscure, and for this reason, if there were no others, is unfitted for the wants of pupils in the early stage of their progress. On the other hand, the triple arrangement here adopted after the example of Ewald, has the recommendation not only of clearness and correctness, but of being, instead of an innovation, a return to old opinions. The scheme of five long and five short vowels originated with Moses and David Kimchi, who were led to it by a comparison of the Latin and its derivatives. From them it was adopted by Reuchlin in his *Rudimenta Hebraica*, and thus became current among Christians. The Jewish grammarians, before the Kimchis, however, reckoned Kibbutz and Shurek as one vowel, Hhirik as one, and even Kamets and Kamets-

Hhatuph as one on account of the identity of the symbol employed to represent them. They thus made out seven vowels, the same number as in Greek, where the distinction into long, short and doubtful also prevails. That the literary impulses of the Orientals were chiefly received from the Greeks is well known; that the suggestion of a vowel-system came to the Syrians from this quarter is certain, both from direct testimony to this effect and from the shapes of their vowels, which still betray their origin. May not the Hebrews have learned something from the same school?

b. The names of the vowels, with the exception of Kamets-Hhatuph contain the sounds of the vowels which they are intended to represent, Kibbutz in the last, the others in their first syllable. Their signification is indicative either of the figure of the vowel or the mode of pronouncing it. Kamets and Kibbutz, *contraction*, i. e. of the mouth; Pattahh, *opening*; Tsere, *bursting forth*; Seghol, *cluster of grapes*; Hhirik, *gnashing*; Hholem, *strength*; Kamets-Hhatuph, *hurried Kamets*; Shurek, *whistling*. It is a curious circumstance that notwithstanding the diversity of the vowel-systems in the Syriac, Arabic, and Hebrew, the name Pattahh is common to them all.

§13. This later and more complete method of noting the vowels does not displace but is superinduced upon the scanty one previously described. Hence it comes to pass that such vowels as were indicated by letters in the first instance are now doubly written, i. e. both by letters and points. By this combination each of the two methods serves to illustrate and explain the other. Thus the added signs determine whether the letters אהרי (which have been formed into the technical word אֶהְיֶה *Eh'vî*) are in any given case to be regarded as vowels or as consonants. If these letters are themselves followed by a vowel or a Sh'va, §16, or have a Daghash forte, §23, they retain their consonant sound; for two vowels never come together in Hebrew, and Sh'va and Daghash forte belong only to consonants: thus קֹוֶה *kōvekā*, מִצֻוֹת *mitsvōth* (where צ being provided with a separate point, the Hholem must belong after ו), וְהָיָה *v'hāyā* קִיָּם *kiyyam*. Otherwise they quiesce in a preceding or accompanying vowel-sign, provided it is homogeneous with themselves; that is to say, they have the sound indicated by it, the vowel-sign merely interpreting what was originally denoted by the



letter. *E* and *i* are homogeneous to י, *o* and *u* to ו, and these being the only vowels which they were ever employed to represent, they can quiesce in no others; thus בִּי *bī*, מִי *mī*, נֵי *nē*, גֵּי *gē*, בּוֹ *bō*, לוֹ *lū*, but שָׂרִי *sāray*, גּוֹי *gōy*, גּוֹלִי *gūlūy*, תָּו *tāv*, שָׁלֵו *shālēv*, זֵו *zīv*; the combination יי is pronounced āv, עָלֵו and עָנֵו *ānāv*, סָתֵו and סָתֵו *s'thāv*. *A*, *e*, and *o* are homogeneous to א and ה. These letters deviate so far from the rule just given that א from its extreme weakness not only quiesces when it is properly a vowel-letter, but may give up its consonant sound and character after any vowel whatever, e. g. תִּתֵּי *tītē*, רִישׁוֹן *rīshōn*, פֹּרֵא *pūrā*; ה is never used as a vowel-letter except at the end of words, and there it always quiesces unless it receives a Mappik, §26.

*a.* As a letter was scarcely ever used to express *ō*, the quiescence of א in Kamets-Hhatuph is very rare, and where it does occur the margin always substitutes a reading without the א, e. g. רִבְיָה Jer. 27:20, הוֹבְלִים Ezek. 27:15, מִיִּרְדֵּי-בֹר Ps. 30:4, רִסְגֵּי-לֹו Isa. 44:17, לְבֹל Jer. 33:8, וְגִדְלֵי-בֹר Nah. 1:3. In אֶנְיָה 2 Chron. 8:18, and בְּמִיתִי Deut. 32:13, ו represents or quiesces in the still briefer *ō* of Hhatuph-Kamets, § 16. 3.

*b.* In a few proper names medial ה quiesces at the end of the first member of the compound, e. g. פֶּדֶה-צֹר Num. 1:10, עֲשֵׂה-אֵל 2 Sam. 2:19, also written עֲשֵׂה-אֵל 1 Chron. 2:16. In such words as נוֹשֶׁבֶה Jer. 22:6, שֶׁפֶּה Deut. 21:7, ה does not quiesce in Kibbutz, for the points belong to the marginal readings נוֹשְׁבוּ, שֶׁפְּכוּ § 46.

§14. On the other hand the vowel-letters shed light upon the stability of the vowels and the quantity of the doubtful signs. 1. As *ī* was scarcely ever and *ū* seldom represented by a vowel-letter, Hhirik with Yodh (י.) is almost invariably long and Shurek (י) commonly so. 2. The occasional absence in individual cases of the vowel-letters, does not determine the quantity of the signs for *i* and *u*; but their uniform absence in any particular words or forms makes it almost certain that the vowel is short. 3. The occasional presence of ו and י to represent one of their homogeneous long vowels proves nothing as to its character; but if in any

word or form these letters are regularly written, the vowel is, as a general rule, immutable. When ו and י stand for their long homogeneous vowels, these latter are said to be written fully, e. g. קֹל *kōl*, נִיר *nīr*, מִוּת *mūth*; without these quiescent letters they are said to be written defectively, e. g. הַקְמוּתִי *h<sup>a</sup>kīmōthī*, כָּמֻס *kāmūs*.

*a.* Hhirik with Yodh is short in וְהַמִּיָּדוּ *vah<sup>a</sup>mittīv* 1 Sam. 17:35. בִּיקְרוּתֶיהָ *bikk'rōthekhā* Ps. 45:10, לִיקְהָתָה *likk'hath* Prov. 30:17. In צִיקְלָג 1 Chron. 12:1, 20, *i* is probably long, although the word is always elsewhere written without the Yodh; as it sometimes has a secondary accent on the first syllable and sometimes not (see 1 Sam. 30:1), it may have had a twofold pronunciation *tsīk'lag*, and *tsiklag*. Shurek as *ū* is of much more frequent occurrence, e. g. חֻקֵּי *hhukkē*, לֻמְמִים *lummīm*, חֻקָּה *hhukkā* Ps. 102:5, אֶלְגֻמִּים 2 Chron. 2:7, זִנְיָה Ezek. 16:34.

§15. The vowels may be further distinguished into pure, *a*, *i*, *u*, and diphthongal, *e*, *o*; *e* being a combination of *a* and *i*, or intermediate between them, and *o* holding the same relation to *a* and *u*.

### SH'VA.

§16. 1. The absence of a vowel is indicated by — Sh'vā (שְׁוָא *emptiness*, or as written by Chayug, the oldest of Jewish grammarians, שְׁבָא), which serves to assure the reader that one has not been inadvertently omitted. It is accordingly placed under all vowelless consonants except at the end of words, where it is regarded as unnecessary, the absence of a vowel being there a matter of course. If, however, the last letter of a word be ד, or if it be immediately preceded by another vowelless letter, or be doubled by the point called Daghesht-forte, § 23, Sh'va is written to preclude the doubt which is possible in these cases, e. g. קֶשֶׁט, מִלְכָּה, מִשְׁמָרְכֶם, אֲמָרָה, אֶת, נָתַתָּ. Sh'va is not given to a quiescent letter, since it represents not a consonant but a vowel, e. g. הַיְיָקָה, nor as a general rule to a final consonant preceded by a

quiescent; thus **וְהָיָה**, **וְהָיָה** Ruth 3 : 4 ; **וְהָיָה** Isa. 62 : 3, though in this case it is sometimes written, e. g. **וְהָיָה** 2 Sam. 14 : 3 ; **וְהָיָה** 2 Sam. 14 : 2 ; **וְהָיָה** Judg. 13 : 3 ; **וְהָיָה** 1 Kin. 11 : 13. א at the end of a word, preceded either by a vowelless letter or a quiescent, is termed otiant, and is left unpointed, e. g. **הוּא רְבוּא וְיָרָא חֵטָא**.

a. Final **ך** may receive Sh'va for the sake of distinction not only from **ק**, as already suggested, but also from **ד** with which it might be in danger of being confounded in manuscripts; Freytag conjectures that it is properly a part of the letter, like the stroke in the corresponding final **ک** in Arabic. In such forms as **רַגְלָיו** Sh'va is omitted with the closing letters because the **י** is not sounded.

2. Sh'va may be either silent (**נָח** *quiescens*), or vocal (**נָע** *mobile*). At the close of syllables it is silent. But at the beginning of a syllable the Hebrews always facilitated the pronunciation of concurrent consonants by the introduction of a hiatus or slight breathing between them; a Sh'va so situated is consequently said to be vocal, and has a sound approaching that of a hastily uttered *e*, as in *given*. This will be represented by an apostrophe, thus, **בְּמִדְבָּר** *b'midhbar*, **פְּקַדְתֶּם** *p'kadhtem*.

a. According to Kimchi (Mikhlol fol. 189) Sh'va was pronounced in three different ways, according to circumstances. (1.) Before a guttural it inclined to the sound of the following vowel, e. g. **וְאָבְדָה** *y'abbēdh*, **שָׁעָה** *s'ēth*, **דָּעָה** *d'ū*, and if accompanied by Methegh, § 44, it had the full sound of that vowel, e. g. **שָׁאוּ** *sūū*, **תִּזְחַזְחַז** *tīzhzhz*, **לֹוֹלָם** *lōōlām*. (2.) Before Yodh it inclined to *i*, e. g. **בְּיָאֵקֹבֶה** *b'yā'kōbh*, **כִּיּוֹם** *k'yōm*, and with Methegh was sounded as Hhirik, e. g. **בִּיָּד** *biyadh*. (3.) Before any other letter it inclined to *a*, e. g. **בְּרָכָה** *b'rākha*, **גְּלִילִים** *g'līlīm*, and with Methegh was pronounced as Pattahh **בְּמַקְהֵלוֹת** *bamakhēloth*.

3. Sh'va may, again, be simple or compound. Sometimes, particularly when the first consonant is a guttural, which from its weakness is in danger of not being distinctly heard, the hiatus becomes still more audible, and is assimilated in sound to the short guttural vowel *ā*, or the diphthongal *ē* or *ō*, into which it enters. This assimilation is rep-

resented by combining the sign for Sh'va with those for the short vowels, thus forming what are called the compound Sh'vas in distinction from the simple Sh'va previously explained.

These are,

Hhātēph-Pattahh    ֿ;    thus, עֲמֹד <sup>a</sup>*mōdh*.

Hhātēph-Seghol    ֿ;    thus, עֲמֹר <sup>e</sup>*mōr*.

Hhātēph-Kamets    ֿ;    thus, חֲלִי <sup>h</sup>*h'li*.

a. Hhātēph (חֲטֵף *snatching*) denotes the rapidity of utterance or the hurried character of the sounds represented by these symbols.

b. The compound Sh'vas, though for the most part restricted to the gutturals, are occasionally written under other consonants in place of simple Sh'va, to indicate more distinctly that it is vocal: thus, Hhateph-Pattahh וְיֹלֵב Gen. 2:12, הִבְרָכָה Gen. 27:38; Hhateph-Kamets לִקְחָה Gen. 2:23, אֶכְתָּבָה Jer. 31:33; but never Hhateph-Seghol except צִלְצְלִים 2 Sam. 6:5 in some editions, e. g. that of Stephanus. This is done with so little uniformity that the same word is differently written in this respect, e. g. בִּסְעָה 2 Kin. 2:1, בִּסְעָה ver. 11.

### PATAHH FURTIVE.

§17. A similar hiatus or slight transition sound was used at the end of words in connection with the gutturals. When ע, ה, or the consonantal ה at the end of words is preceded by a long heterogeneous vowel (i. e. another than *a*), or is followed by another vowelless consonant, it receives a Pattahh furtive ֿ, which resembles in sound an extremely short *a*, and is pronounced before the letter under which it is written, e. g. רוּחַ *rū<sup>a</sup>hh*, שָׁמַע *shāmō<sup>a</sup>*, מַגְבִּיהַ *maghbī<sup>a</sup>h*, שָׁמַעַת *shūma<sup>a</sup>t*, יִהְיֶה *yi<sup>a</sup>hhd*.

a. Some grammarians deny that Pattahh furtive can be found under a penultimate guttural, contending that the vowel-sign is in such cases a proper Pattahh, and that שָׁמַעַת should accordingly be read *shāmaat*, and יִהְיֶה *yihhad*. But both the Sh'va under the final letter, §16, and the Daghesh-lene in it, §21, show that the guttural is not followed by a vowel. The sign beneath it must consequently be Pattahh furtive, and represent an antecedent vowel-sound. In some manuscripts Pattahh furtive is written as Hhateph-Pattahh, or even as simple Sh'va; thus, רָקִיעַ or רָקִיעַֿ for רָקִיעַ.

## SYLLABLES.

§18. 1. Syllables are formed by the combination of consonants and vowels. As two vowels never come together in the same word in Hebrew without an intervening consonant, there can never be more than one vowel in the same syllable; and with the single exception of א occurring at the beginning of words, no syllable ever consists of a vowel alone. Every syllable, with the exception just stated, must begin with a consonant, and may begin with two, but never with more than two. Syllables ending with a vowel, whether represented by a quiescent letter or not, are called simple, e. g. אֵלֶּה *l'khā*, עוֹלָה *ō-lā*. (The first syllable of this second example begins, it will be perceived, with the consonant ע, though this disappears in the notation given of its sound.) Syllables ending with a consonant, or, as is possible at the close of a word, with two consonants, are said to be mixed: thus קָמְתֶּם *kam-tem*, הִלַּכְתָּ *hū-lakht*. As the vocal Sh'vas, whether simple or compound, are not vowels properly speaking, but simply involuntary transition sounds, they, with the consonants under which they stand, cannot form distinct syllables, but are attached to that of the following vowel. Pattahh furtive in like manner belongs to the syllable formed by the preceding vowel. Thus זָרוּעַ *z'rō'*, אָנִי *°nī* are monosyllables.

2. Long vowels always stand in simple syllables, and short vowels in mixed syllables, unless they be accented. But accented syllables, whether simple or mixed, may contain indifferently a long or a short vowel.

α. The following may serve as a specimen of the division of Hebrew words into their proper syllables; thus,

אָדָם	אֱלֹהִים	בְּרָא	בְּיוֹם	אָדָם	הוֹלִידָהּ	סֵפֶר	זֶה
ā-dhā'm	°lō-hī'm	b'rō'	b'yō'm	ā-dhā'm	tō-l'dhō'th	sē'-pher	zē'

Gen. 5 : 1. אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה בְּדִמְיוֹתָ

אֱלֹהִים	עָשָׂה	בְּדִמְיוֹתָ
°lō-thō'	ā-sā'	°lō-hī'm bidh-mū'th

b. The reason of the rule for the quantity of syllables appears to be this. In consequence of their brevity, the short vowels required the addition of a following consonant to make the utterance full and complete, unless the want of this was compensated by the greater energy of pronunciation due to the accent. The long vowels were sufficiently complete without any such addition, though they were capable of receiving it under the new energy imparted by the accent. This pervading regularity, which is so striking a feature of the Hebrew language, was the foundation of the *systema morarum* advocated by some of the older grammarians of Holland and Germany. The idea of this was, that each syllable was equal to three *morae*, that is, three rests, or a bar of three beats; a long vowel being equivalent to two *morae*, or two beats, a short vowel to one, and the initial or final consonant or consonants also to one: thus קָטָלָה  $k(1) + \bar{a}(2) = 3$ ,  $t(1) + a(1) + l(1) = 3$ . An accented syllable might have one *mora* or beat either more or less than the normal quantity. This system was not only proposed by way of grammatical explanation, but also made the basis of a peculiar theory of Hebrew prosody. See Gesenius, *Geschichte d. Heb. Sprache*, p. 123.

c. The cases in which short vowels occur in unaccented simple syllables, are all due to the disturbing influence exerted by the weak letters upon the normal forms of words; thus, הֶלֶת *hā-ēth* is for הֵלֶת, and הָהוּא *hā-hū'* for *hāh-hū'*: such words as הָשָׂא, פָּרָא, פָּלָא, הָגָה, קָצָה are formed after the analogy of מָלַךְ. A long vowel in an unaccented mixed syllable is found in but one word, and that of foreign origin, בֶּלְטָשָׁאֲצִיר *bēl-t'shāts-ār*, though here, as in the majority of instances falling under the previous remark, the syllable receives, if not the primary, yet the secondary accent, e. g. הַעֲדוּתִי, הַהֲלִים, קֶצֶמֶר. The same is the case when a long vowel is retained before Makkeph, e. g. שֶׁת־לִּי. In the Arabic, which is exceedingly rich in vowels, there are comparatively few mixed syllables; nearly every consonant has its own vowel, and this more frequently short than long. The Chaldee, which is more sparing in its use of vowels than the Hebrew, observes in general the same rule with respect to the quantity of syllables, though not with the same inflexible consistency.

### AMBIGUOUS SIGNS.

§19. It will now be possible, by aid of the principles already recited, to determine the quantity of the doubtful vowels, and to remove the ambiguity which appears to exist in certain vowel-signs.

1. Hhirik, Shurek, and Kibbutz, in unaccented simple syllables, must be long, and in unaccented mixed syllables, short, e. g. יִרָשׁ or יֶרֶשׁ *yī-rash*, יִבְּחִי or יֶבְחִי *yibh-nū*, גִּבְּלוּ or גֶּבְלוּ *g'bhū-lō*, יֻלַּד or יוּלַּד *yul-ladh*, כֻּלָּם or כוּלָּם *kul-lām*, מַעֲדִי



or מַעֲזִי *māuzzī*. In accented syllables, whether simple or mixed, they are always long, e. g. שִׁירָם or שִׁירִים *sī-hīm*, לִי *lī*, גָּבִיל or גָּבִיל *g'bhūl*, דְּרָשָׁהּ or דְּרָשֶׁהָ *d'rā-shū-hū*, the only exception being that Hhirik is short in the monosyllabic particles אֵם, אֶשׁ, עֵם, מֵן, and in some abbreviated verbal forms of the class called Lamedh-He, e. g. וְלֵז, וְלִשְׁבֹּ, וְלִרְבֹּ.

The only cases of remaining doubt are those in which these vowels are followed by a letter with Sh'va, either simple or compound. If the former, it might be a question whether it was silent or vocal, and consequently whether the syllable was simple or mixed. If the latter, though the syllable is of course simple, the weak letter which follows may interfere with the operation of the law. Here the etymology must decide. The vowel is long or short as the grammatical form may require; thus in יִרְאֶה-לּוֹ, תִּהְיֶה, יִהְיֶה Gen. 22 : 8, which follow the analogy of יִקְטֹל, and in סִבְכִי Isa. 10 : 34, קָמְצוּ the first vowel is short; in יִשְׁמְךָ, גָּבִלְכֶם the first vowel is long. In a few instances the grammatical form in which Hhirik is employed is itself doubtful; the distinction is then made by means of Methegh, §44, which is added to the vowel-sign if it is long, but not if it is short; thus, יִרְאֵי *yī-r'ū*, from יִרָא *to fear*, and יִשְׁנו *yī-sh'nū* from יִשָּׁן *to sleep*; but יִרְאֵי *yir-ū* from יִרָא *to see*, and יִשְׁנו *yish-nū* from יִשְׁנָה *to do a second time*.

2. Kamets *ā* and Kamets-Hhatuph *ō* are both represented by the same sign (ֹ), but may be distinguished by rules similar to those just given. In an unaccented simple syllable it is Kamets; in an unaccented mixed syllable it is Kamets-Hhatuph; in an accented syllable, whether simple or mixed it is Kamets, e. g. דָּבָר *dā-bhār*, חֲפָשִׁי *hhoph-shī*, מָוֶה *mā-veth*, לָמָה *lām-mā*, בֹּתִים *bot-tīm*. Before a letter with simple Sh'va, the distinction is mostly made by Methegh, §44; without Methegh it is always Kamets-Hhatuph, with it commonly Kamets, e. g. חֲכָמָה *hhokh-mā*, חֲכָמָה *hhā-kh'mā*. Before a guttural with Hhateph-Kamets or Kamets-Hhatuph

it is frequently *ō*, though standing in a simple syllable and accompanied by Methegh, e. g. בְּהָרִי *bo-hh°rī*, תִּבְחֶנְהֶם *to obhḏhēm*. The surest criterion, however, and in many cases the only decisive one, is found in the etymology. If the vowel be derived from Hholem, or the grammatical form requires an *o* or a short vowel, it is Kamets-Hhatuph; but if it be derived from Pattahh, or the form requires an *a* or a long vowel, it is Kamets: thus וְאֵנִיָּה with the prefixed conjunction *vo°niyyōth*, הָאֵנִיָּה with the article *hā°niyyā*; יַעֲמֹד in the Hophal *yo°madh*, יִתְאַדָּה Isa. 44:13 in the Piel *y'thā°rēhū*. The first vowel is *ō* in צָהָר from צָהַר, קָדְשִׁים from קָדַשׁ, קָדַשׁ from קָדַשׁ, עֲשֶׂה-לִּי Isa. 38:14, קָבֵה-לִּי Num. 22:11, אָרֶה-לִּי Num. 23:7 and the like, and the first two vowels in such words as פָּעַלְכֶם from פָּעַל, מֵאֲסָכֶם Isa. 30:12 from מָאֵס, קָרַבְכֶם Deut. 20:2, קָטַבָּה Hos. 13:14, קָטַלְתִּי 2 Chron. 10:10, קָבַלְתֶּם 2 Kin. 15:10, because they are shortened from Hholem. On the other hand the first vowel is *ā* in שִׁהַר Job 16:19 from שָׁהַר, הָרָשִׁים from הָרַשׁ, בְּמִתִּי from בָּמִה, and in מֵאֲסָה, קָרַבָּה and the like, because it is originally and properly Kamets. The word שִׁמְרָה is in Ps. 86:2 the imperative *shomrā*, in Job 10:12 the preterite *shām'rā*.

a. In a very few instances Kamets-Hhatuph is found in a syllable bearing a conjunctive accent, viz.: הָרָפִי Ps. 38:21, קָל Ps. 35:10, also Prov. 19:7 (in some copies), and in the judgment of Ewald סָגַד Judg. 19:5, comp. ver. 8 and עָב Ezek. 41:25; in Dan. 11:12 יָרְנִם the points belong to the marginal reading וִירָם, and the vowel is consequently Kamets. There are also a few cases in which Kamets remains in a mixed syllable, deprived of its accent by Makkeph, § 43, without receiving Methegh, viz.: מִנְהָ Ps. 16:5, קָרַבָּה Ps. 55:19, 22, סָבָה Ps. 74:5; and a final unaccented Kamets is not affected by the insertion of Daghesht-forse conjunctive, § 24, in the initial letter of the following word, e. g. מִשְׁחָה שָׁם Gen. 31:13. When an accent takes the place of Methegh, it serves equally to distinguish *ā* from *ō*, e. g. וְנָגַף Ex. 21:22 *v'nāgh'phū*, וְנָגַף Ex. 21:35 *ūmākh'rū*. § 45. 5.

b. Inasmuch as מִתְחַר is derived from מִחָר *māhhār*, its first vowel might be suspected to be *ā*; but as it is so constantly written with Hhateph-Kamets, the preceding vowel is probably conformed to it. It is consequently regarded and pronounced as *ō*. Kimchi (Mikhlol, fol. 188) declares that the first vowel in הָרַבָּן 1 Sam. 13:21, הָרַבָּנוֹת Eccles. 12:11



and **הַלֵּלִי** Num. 24: 7 was universally held to be Kamets, and that with the exception of Rabbi Jonah ben Gannach, who was of a contrary mind, the same unanimity prevailed in regard to the first vowel of **קָרָן** Ezek. 40: 43. As, however, this last word is in every other place written without the Methegh, and there is no analogy for such words as those mentioned above having *ā* in their initial syllable, the best authorities are now agreed that the vowel is *ō*. and the words are accordingly read *dorbhān*, etc. In **יָסַף** *jasper*, and **קָרָן** *emerald*, Ezek. 28: 13, which are mentioned by Kimchi in the same connection, the first vowel is Kamets.

c. In some manuscripts and a few of the older printed books, e. g. Stephanus' Hebrew Bible and Reuchlin's Rudimenta Hebraica, Kamets-Hhatuph is denoted by ( **ר** ). It then differs from Kamets, but is liable to be confounded with Hhateph-Kamets. It can, however, be distinguished from it by the circumstance that Kamets-Hhatuph is always followed either by simple Sh'va, Daghes-forte, or Methegh; none of which ever immediately succeed Hhateph-Kamets. Such a form as **קָרָן** Ezek. 26: 9 in the editions of Michaelis and Van der Hooght is an impossible one if ( **ר** ) have its ordinary meaning.

d. It is surprising that in so minute and careful a system of orthography as that of the Masorites, there should be no symbol for *ō* distinct from that for *ā*; and some have felt constrained in consequence to suppose that the signs for these two vowels were originally different, but became assimilated in the course of transcription. This seems unlikely, however. The probability is that *ā* and *ō*, whose resemblance even we can perceive, were so closely allied in the genuine Hebrew pronunciation, that one sign was thought sufficient to represent them, especially as the Masorites were intent simply on indicating sounds without concerning themselves with grammatical relations.

§ 20. 1. As simple Sh'va is vocal at the beginning of a syllable and silent at its close, there can be no doubt as to its character when it stands under initial or final letters. Preceding the first vowel of a word it must of course be vocal, and following the last vowel it must be silent, **זְכַרְתָּם** *z'kheartām*, **זָכַרְתָּ** *zākheart*. In the middle of a word, the question whether it belongs to the syllable of the preceding or the following vowel must be determined by the circumstances. If a complete syllable precedes, that is, either an unaccented long vowel or a vowelless consonant serving as the complement of a previous short vowel, it is vocal. If it be preceded by a short vowel which cannot make a complete syllable without the aid of a following consonant, or by a long accented

vowel, it is silent: זָכָרִי *zō-kh'rē*, תִּזְכָּרוּ *tiz-k'rū*, זִכְרוּ *zikh-rū*, תִּקְטֹלְנָה *tiktōl-nā*. Sh'va under a letter doubled by Daghesh forte, § 23, is vocal, such a letter being equivalent to two, the first of which completes the previous syllable, and the second begins the syllable which follows: הִזְכָּרִים = הִזְזָכָרִים *haz-z'khūrīm*.

2. In addition to this it is to be remarked that Sh'va is vocal after what may be called intermediate syllables; that is to say, when the consonant under which it stands performs, as it occasionally does, the double office of completing one syllable and beginning the next. Thus, when it follows a consonant from which Daghesh-forte has been omitted, וַיִּבְחַשׁ *vay'bhak'shū* for *vay-y'bhak-k'shū*, or the first of two similar letters, in order that the reduplication may be made more distinct, הָלַלְוּ *hal'lū*, קִלְלַת *kil'lath*, צִלְלוּ *tsil'lō*, אָלְלִי *al'lay*, חִיקְכֶּם *hhik'kē*, and in several other cases, which will be more particularly described in § 22.

a. The same double office is performed by gutturals beginning one syllable and yet inclining to complete the one before it, § 18. 2. c. In הִנֵּה, for example, ה belongs in a measure to both syllables. It properly begins the second, and yet it is preceded by a short vowel just as if it ended the first, which is accordingly to be reckoned an intermediate syllable, being in strictness neither simple nor mixed, but partaking of the nature of both.

## DAGHESH-LENE.

§ 21. The second class of signs added to the Hebrew text are those which are designed to guide in the pronunciation of the consonants. These are the diacritical point over Shin, Daghesh-lene, Daghesh-forte, Mappik, and Raphe. The use of the first of these has already been sufficiently explained, § 3. 1.

1. Daghesh-lene (דָּגֶשׁ לֵנֶה) is a point inserted in the six letters כ פ ט ב ג ד (technically called *B'ghadh K'phath*), to indicate the loss of their aspiration, e. g. כ *bh*, פ *b*, etc.

As these letters are always aspirated after a vowel-sound, however slight, and never as an initial utterance or when following a consonant, they invariably require Daghesh-lene whenever they are not immediately preceded by a vowel or a vocal Sh'va. It is consequently inserted in the initial aspirate of a word which begins a verse, בְּרֵאשִׁית Gen. 1:1, or which follows a word bearing a disjunctive accent (inasmuch as this represents a pause of longer or shorter duration), וּבִיתוֹ בְּאוֹר Ex. 1:1, פֶּן עֲתָה Gen. 3:22, or ending in a consonant, מִצְלִיחַ דְּרָכֵי אֱלֹהֵינוּ Gen. 24:42; but not if it follows a word ending in a vowel and having a conjunctive accent, הָיְתָה תָּהָי, פָּנֵי הַחַיִּים Gen. 1:2. The sacred name יְהוָה is followed by Daghesh-lene, even though it may have a conjunctive accent, Num. 10:29, Deut. 3:26, Josh. 10:30, 11:8, Ps. 18:21, because in reading the Jews always substitute for it the word אֱלֹהֵינוּ, which ends in a consonant. In a very few cases, however, e. g. אֱלֹהֵינוּ בָּם Ps. 68:18, קִרְוָהוּ Isa. 34:11, שְׁלֵךְ בָּהּ Ezek. 23:42, Daghesh-lene is not inserted after a vowel-letter, which retains its consonant sound.

2. Daghesh-lene is inserted in a medial or final aspirate preceded by a vowelless consonant, whether this be accompanied by silent Sh'va or Pattahh furtive, e. g. שְׂמֵעָה, נִסְתַּחֲרָה; but not if it be preceded by a vowel or vocal Sh'va, whether simple or compound, e. g. עֲבַדְתֶּם, וּבְבִית.

a. The primary signification of the name Daghesh is commonly explained from the Syriac ܕܝܓܝܫ (דִּגִּישׁ), to which Castellus in his lexicon gives the sense of *piercing*. This is by some applied to the puncture or point which is its written sign, by others to its power of sharpening the sound of letters by removing their aspiration or doubling them. Buxtorf, however, in his Chaldee Lexicon, disputes the existence of such a root in either Syriac or Chaldee, alleging that in Prov. 12:18, the passage quoted to prove the word, the true reading is ܕܝܓܝܫ (דִּגִּישׁ). The six letters which receive Daghesh-lene in Hebrew have the same twofold pronunciation in Syriac, a red dot called Rukhokh (ܕܝܓܝܫ *softness*), being written beneath them when they were to be aspirated, and another called Kushoi (ܕܝܓܝܫ *hardness*), being written above them when they were not.

b. Grammarians are not agreed whether the aspirated or unaspirated sound of these consonants was the original one. There being no data for the settlement of the question, each decides it by his own theory of phonetic changes. The correctness of the Masoretic punctuation has sometimes been questioned in regard to this matter, on the ground of the improbability of such fluctuation in the sound of these letters in the same word. But besides the Syriac analogy just referred to, the Sanskrit language shows the almost unlimited extent to which euphonic changes may be carried by a people possessing a sensitive and discriminating ear. The Sanskrit aspirates, besides being subjected to other mutations which cannot here be detailed, regularly lose their aspiration when finals, and under certain conditions when medials, throwing it back, where this is possible, upon a previous letter. Bopp *Kritische Grammatik*, pp. 30. 42. Similar laws prevail to some extent in Greek, e. g. *θρίξ*, *τριχός*; *τρέφω*, *θρέψω*; *θύω*, *εὐθύθην*; *οὐκ ἔχω*, *οὐχ ἔξω*; *μεθ' ὑμῶν*.

§ 22. The absence of Daghesh-lene in an aspirate sometimes shows a preceding simple Sh'va to be vocal when this would not otherwise have been known. In most of the cases referred to, a letter originally belonging to the succeeding syllable is by the prefixing of a short vowel drawn back to complete the syllable before it; instead, however, of giving up its previous connection altogether, it forms an intermediate syllable, § 20. 2, the Sh'va remaining vocal though the antecedent vowel is short; thus, *לָבַב* *l'bhabh* with the prefix *ב* becomes *בִּלְבַב* *bil'bhabh*, not *בִּלְבַב* *bil-babh*.

a. The particular instances in which this may occur are the following, viz.: (1) The Kal imperative of verbs and the Kal infinitive with suffixes, e. g. *עֲבֹדוּ*, *עֲבֹדוּ*, *עֲבֹדוּ*, *עֲבֹדוּ* from *עָבַד*; yet with occasional exceptions, as *בְּאַסְפָּחִים* Lev. 23:39. (2) Those forms of Pe Guttural verbs in which the first radical assumes a short vowel in place of the silent Sh'va in the regular inflexion, e. g. *יַעֲבֹדוּ*, *יַעֲבֹדוּ* for *יַעֲבֹדוּ*, *יַעֲבֹדוּ*. (3) The construct plural of nouns *עֲבָדִים* from *עֲבָדִים*, *קְהָלִים* from *קְהָלִים*, *חֲרָבוֹת* from *חֲרָבוֹת*, though with occasional exceptions, as *רְשָׁפִי* Cant. 8:6, but *רְשָׁפִי* Ps. 76:4, *צִמְדִּי* Isa. 5:10, *חֲרָפוֹת* Ps. 69:10, *בְּרִיָּה* Gen. 50:23, but *בְּרִיָּה* Judg. 7:6; *בְּגָדִי* from *בְּגָדִי* are peculiar in omitting Daghesh in the singular with suffixes. (4) Three feminine nouns ending in *וֹת*, *מְלָכֹת* from *מֶלֶךְ*, *בְּלָדֹת* from *בֶּלֶד*, *עֲבָדֹת* (only occurring with suffixes) from *עָבַד*, but not *מְרָדֹת*. Also a few other nouns of different forms, viz.: *וִרְבָּתִים*, but *וִרְבָּתִי*, *שְׂפָפָה*, *וִרְבָּתִי*, *וִרְבָּתִי* Josh. 15:38, *וִרְבָּתִי* Josh. 15:56. (5) After prefixes, as He interrogative, e. g. *הִיִּדְעָתָם* Gen. 29:5 from *וִדְעָתָם*, and inseparable prepositions, e. g. *לְדָבִיר* from *דָּבִיר*, *בְּדָגָה* from *דָּגָה*, *דָּבִיר* from *דָּבִיר*. Usage is not uniform in the case of Kal infinitives follow-

ing inseparable prepositions, e. g. לְכַתּוּב, בְּכַתּוּב; בְּנִפְל, בְּנִפְל, בְּנִפְל; לְצַבֵּא Isa. 31:4, לְצַבֵּא Num. 4:23, 8:24; לְפֹדֶה, לְפֹדֶה. (6) The suffixes of the second person ׁ, ׁ, ׁ, never receive Daghesh-lene, בְּנִי, בְּנִי, בְּנִי.

These rules are sometimes of importance in etymology; thus, עֲזַבְנִי Ezek. 27:12 must have as its ground form עֲזַבְנִי, not עֲזַבְנִי; and אֲרַב Hos. 7:6, רַב Ps. 90:10 cannot be infinitives with suffixes, but must be from the segholates אֲרַב, אֲרַב.

b. The omission of Daghesh-lene in the final letter of הוֹסֶסָה Prov. 30:6, abbreviated from הוֹסֶסָה or הוֹסֶסָה, is exceptional. The Daghesh occasionally occurring in initial aspirates after words ending in a vowel and having a conjunctive accent, is best explained not as an exception to the ordinary rules, but as Daghesh forte conjunctive, § 24, e. g. אֲרַצָּה פְּנִינִי Gen. 11:31 and elsewhere, אֲרַצָּה גִּשְׁן Gen. 46:28, גִּשְׁן גִּשְׁן Ex. 15:1, 21, גִּשְׁן גִּשְׁן Ex. 15:13, וְעִשְׂתִּי פֶסַח Deut. 16:1 (comp. עִשְׂתִּי פֶסַח Gen. 20:9), וְאֶעֱיֶדָה בָּם Deut. 31:28 (comp. וְאֶעֱיֶדָה לִי Isa. 8:2), וְיִהְיֶה מְבֻלֹת Josh. 8:24, 10:20, עֲלֶנָּה פֶּרֶץ Gen. 35:29, נִשְׁכָּה בּוֹ Isa. 40:7. See also Gen. 39:12, Ex. 14:4, 17, Isa. 10:9, Job 9:2, Ex. 15:11, 16, Ps. 35:10, Isa. 54:12, Jer. 20:9, Dan. 3:3, 5:11. The old strife as to the Daghesh in the word שְׂתִירָם *two* is not yet settled. Kimchi explained it as Daghesh-lene upon the supposition that the word was abridged from אֲשִׁתִּירָם; Schultens as Daghesh-forte arising from an assimilated נ, contending that it was for שְׂתִירָם from שְׂנִיתִירָם; Nordheimer as an anomalous Daghesh-lene, introduced as a euphonic expedient to prevent the combination of an aspirated ה with a sibilant, such as is obviated in the Hithpael of verbs by a transposition that would here be inadmissible. The puzzle is still further perplexed by the circumstance that it once appears with the preposition מִן without the Daghesh, מִשְׂתִּירִי Judg. 16:28, and again with the same preposition with it, מִשְׂתִּירִים Jon. 4:11, the Methegh showing the Sh'va to be vocal, as might also be inferred from the fact that Daghesh-forte has been omitted.

### DAGHESH-FORTE.

§ 23. 1. When the same consonant was repeated with a vowel or even the slightest hiatus intervening, so that successive movements of the organs of speech were required in the pronunciation, the Hebrews invariably wrote the letter twice. When, however, there was no interval between the reduplicated consonants, and the only audible result was a more protracted or vehement utterance of the same sound effected by a single effort of the organs, the letter was written but once. This fact the Masoretic punctuators have indicated by placing a point called Daghesh-forte (דָּגֶשׁ הָזָק) in the bosom of a letter so affected, to show that it is to be

doubled in the pronunciation; thus, וַיִּמָּל *vayyimāl*. Daghesh-forte may be found in any letter with the exception of the gutturals א ה ח ע, which on account of their weakness do not admit of reduplication. The letter ר, partaking of this with other peculiarities of the gutturals, receives it only in a very few exceptional cases, e. g. שְׂרַאשֵׁר, מְרַח.

2. The aspirates, when doubled, always at the same time lose their aspiration; thus, יִפְקֹד *yippākēdh*. Daghesh-forte in these letters is readily distinguishable from Daghesh-lene by the consideration that a consonant cannot be pronounced double except after a vowel. A point in one of the aspirates is, therefore, Daghesh-forte if a vowel precedes, otherwise it is Daghesh-lene.

3. Daghesh-forte in ר may be distinguished from Shurek in the same way. Inasmuch as two vowels cannot come together in the same word, if a vowel precedes it is Daghesh-forte, if not it is Shurek.

*a.* Some Grammarians speak of Daghesh-forte *implicitum* in the gutturals, by which they mean that these letters appear in certain cases to complete a foregoing syllable as well as to begin that in which they properly stand, in spite of the omission of Daghesh, which analogy would require them to receive. As these are included under what have already, § 20. 2. *a.*, been explained as intermediate syllables, it is not thought necessary to employ an additional term.

*b.* The Arabs have a sign of reduplication, Teshdid (◌◌), which is written above the doubled letter. The Syrians have no written sign for this purpose, and it is disputed whether their letters were ever doubled in pronunciation. According to Asseman Biblioth. Orient. III. 2. p. 379, the Western differed from the Eastern Syrians in this respect, "Occidentales nullibi literas geminant."

§ 24. Different epithets have been applied to Daghesh-forte to describe its various uses or the occasions of its employment. 1. When separate letters, whether originally alike, or made so by assimilation, are by the inflection or formation of words brought into juxtaposition, the Daghesh-



forte which represents such a doubling is called compensative; e. g. כָּרְתִּי, formed by appending the syllable תִּי to the root כָּרַת; נָחֲתִי composed of the same syllable and the root נָחַת, whose last letter is changed to ת to conform with that which follows; סָבִי from סָבַב. 2. When the reduplication is indicative of a particular grammatical form the Daghesh-forte is called characteristic, e. g. in the Piel, Pual, and Hithpael of verbs; as, הִלָּךְ, הִתְהַלָּךְ, and certain forms of nouns, as, גִּבּוֹר. 3. When it has arisen from the necessity of converting a previous simple syllable into a mixed one in order to preserve the quantity of a short vowel which it contains, it is Daghesh-forte conservative; e. g. יִסֵּב for יָסַב. 4. When the initial letter of a word is doubled under the influence of the final vowel of the word preceding, it is Daghesh-forte conjunctive; e. g. מִהֲיָהּ, יְהִי־הֵלֶךְ, קוֹמֵי צֹאֵי. 5. When the last letter of an intermediate syllable is doubled in order to make the following hiatus or vocal Sh'va more distinct, it is Daghesh-forte dirimens or separative, because the letter which receives it is thus separated in part from the syllable to which it belongs; e. g. עֲנִיִּי *inn'bhē* for עֲנִי *in'bhē*. 6. When the first letter of a final syllable is doubled under the influence of a previous vowel bearing the accent (mostly a pause accent, § 36. 2. *a.*), for the sake of increased fullness and force of pronunciation, it is Daghesh-forte emphatic; e. g. הִתְהַלֵּי for הִתְהַלִּי. In the first three uses named above Daghesh-forte is said to be essential, in the last three it is euphonic.

*a.* Daghesh-forte conjunctive occurs regularly after the pronoun מֶה, e. g. מֶה טוֹב וּמֶה-נִלְוִים Ps. 133: 1, and in a multitude of cases after final Kamets or Seghol in words accented on the penult or followed by Makkeph, § 43, e. g. לִקְחָהּ-זֹאת Gen. 2: 23, אֶבְכְּתָשֶׁם Deut. 27: 7, וְהִיָּתָה לוֹ Num. 25: 13, עֲנִתָהּ-בִּי Gen. 30: 33; וְהִיָּתָה Num. 34: 6, 7, 9. מִשָּׁה לְאַמֵּר Ex. 13: 1 (where the accent is on the ultimate), מִצְנֶה-רֶךְ Prov. 15: 1 (in some editions), more rarely after other vowels, e. g. קוֹמֵי צֹאֵי Gen. 19: 14, וְיִצְמָרוּ לָא 1 Sam. 8: 19, once after the liquid ר, e. g. וַיֵּאמֶר לָא 1 Kin. 11: 22. See also § 22. *b.* In a few instances words thus united are written as one, e. g. מִיָּה Ex. 4: 2 for מֵה יָה, so מִלְכָּם Isa. 3: 15, מִתְלָאָה Mal. 1: 13, בְּסִסְאָהּ



Isa. 27:8, and possibly אֶרְאֶלְךָ Isa. 33:7. See Dr. Alexander's Commentary upon this passage.

b. Daghesh-forte separative occurs only in the following examples:

אֶבְרָהָהוּ Hos. 3:2.	יִקְרָהוּ 1 Sam. 28:10.	סִבְלוֹ Isa. 9:3, 10:27.
בִּיקְרוֹתֶיךָ Ps. 45:10.	כְּסֹתוֹתֶיכֶנָּה (?) Ezek. 13:20.	עֲנִיבִי Deut. 32:32.
הַיְבָתִּים Am. 5:25.	הַכְּצִעְתָּהוּ Gen. 18:21.	עֲנִיתִי 2 Sam. 23:27, Jer. 29:27.
הַבְּתִנֶּה Gen. 37:32.	מִטְהִירוֹ or מִטְהִירוֹ Ps. 89:45.	עֲצִיבִיכֶם Isa. 58:3.
הַלֶּכֶן Gen. 17:17.	מִמְּגִירוֹ Joel 1:17.	עֲצִיבִיכֶם Am. 5:21.
הִרְאִיתֶם 1 Sam. 10:24, 17:25, 2 Kin. 6:32.	מִמְּרִירוֹ Job 9:18.	עֲקִבִי (?) Cant. 1:8.
הִמְרוֹתֶם Job 17:2.	מִנְזִירוֹ Nah. 3:17.	עֲקִבוֹת Ps. 89:52.
הִצְפִּינוּ Ex. 2:3.	מִקְדָּשׁ Ex. 15:17.	עֲקִבוֹתֶיךָ Ps. 77:20.
הִדְרִיפְהוּ (?) Judg. 20:43.	מִקְרָה Deut. 23:11.	עֲשׂוּבוֹת Prov. 27:25.
הִרְעַמָּה 1 Sam. 1:6.	נִבְאוֹ Job 30:8.	צִמְחָתֶיךָ Ps. 119; 139.
הִלְקִי- Isa. 57:6.	נִצְרָה Ps. 141:3.	צִמְחָתוֹנִי Ps. 88:17.
הִקְתָּה Gen. 49:10.	נִצְרָה Prov. 4:13.	קִשְׁתוֹתֶם (?) Ps. 37:15, Isa. 5:28.
לִיקְתָּהוּ Prov. 30:17.	נִתְקַנְיָהוּ Judg. 20:32.	שִׁבְלִי Zech. 4:12.
	סִבְבוֹ Jer. 4:7.	שִׁבְלוֹ Ps. 58:9.

This list is corrected and enlarged from Gesen. Lehrs. pp. 86 ff. Those words which are followed by a note of interrogation (?) are found in some editions but not in others. Daghesh separative may be found after He interrogative in some instances not included in the above list.

c. Daghesh-forte emphatic occurs only in הִדְלִי Judg. 5:7, 1 Sam. 2:5; וִיחַלְוֹ Job 29:21; וִיחַלְוֹ or וִיחַלְוֹ Job 21:13; וִיצָהוּ Isa. 33:12, Jer. 51:58; מִלְשָׁה Ezek. 21:15; נִקְוֹשׁוּ Ezek. 6:9; נִשְׁתָּהוּ Jer. 51:30; נִחְנוּ Ezek. 27:19; קִמְלִי (?) Isa. 19:6; and probably הִדְלִי Job 13:9 (not in pause).

§ 25. In order to the distinct utterance of a reduplicated consonant, it must be followed as well as preceded by a vowel-sound. Daghesh-forte is consequently never written in a final vowelless letter, with the exception of the two words אֶת, נֶתָּה, both of which end in aspirates whose pronunciation would be changed by the removal of the Daghesh. In every other instance the doubling is neglected, even though the letter be an aspirate, which will for this reason resume its aspiration; e. g. קָל, קָלָה; סֵב, סֵבִי; וִיחַחֵה abridged from וִיחַחֵה; וִינַחֵה from וִינַחֵה. In a medial letter with Sh'va Daghesh may be written, because the Sh'va being thus rendered vocal the reduplication can be made audible by means

of the hiatus which it represents; it is, however, quite as frequently omitted, the Sh'va commonly remaining vocal as if it were inserted, and compound Sh'va being occasionally substituted for simple to indicate this fact, § 16. 3. *b.*; e. g. עוֹרִים for עוֹרִים, כֶּסֶף for כֶּסֶף, particularly after prefixes, as Vav conversive, the article and preposition מְ, so וְיָהִי, הַמִּבְקֵשׁ. It is seldom omitted from a medial aspirate on account of the change in its sound involved: yet even this is done occasionally, e. g. מִבְּצִיר Judg. 8 : 2 for מִבְּצִיר, תִּתְּצֵר Isa. 22 : 10 for תִּתְּצֵר, זָכְרוֹן from זָכְרוֹן. In a few rare instances it is dropped from a letter followed by a vowel, when the laws of syllables will permit and the pronunciation will not be materially affected; e. g. תִּעֲגְגָה Ruth 1 : 13 for תִּעֲגְגָה.

#### MAPPĪK.

§ 26. Mappīk (מִפִּיק *bringing out or uttering*), is a point in one of the letters א ה ו י, showing that it represents a consonant and not a vowel, or in other words that it does not quiesce in the preceding vowel-sign. It is unnecessary, however, to employ any notation for this purpose in the case of א ו and י, for their quiescence can be readily determined in all cases by the rules already given, § 13. Although it is much more extensively used in manuscripts, therefore, Mappik is in modern editions of the Hebrew Bible only inserted in final ה when it retains its consonantal power; e. g. אַרְצָה *artsāh*, אֲרָצָה *artsā*, לְקַחְהָ *l'kāhhāh*, לָקַחְהָ *lāk'hhā*. The point four times found in א, וּבְיָמָיו Gen. 43 : 26, Ezra 8 : 18, תִּבְרִיאָה Lev. 23 : 17, רָאִי Job 33 : 21, though called a Daghes in the Masoretic notes in the margin, is probably to be regarded as Mappik.

#### RAPHE.

§ 27. Rāphe (רַפֵּה *weak*), is a small horizontal stroke placed over a letter, and denotes the opposite of Daghesh.

lene, Daghesh-forte, or Mappik, as the case may be. As no inconvenience can arise from its omission, it is only occasionally used in modern Bibles, and not with entire uniformity in the different editions. It is chiefly found where a Mappik has been omitted in ה, which according to analogy might be expected to be inserted, e. g. הַיְּסֻדָּה Ex. 9:18, וְשִׁעְרָה Lev. 13:4, בְּהִטָּאָה Num. 15:28, לָהּ Num. 32:42, מִשְׁכָּמָה Job 31:22 in some copies. In תַּעֲשֶׂה-לָּהּ Ex. 20:4, Deut. 5:8, it is the opposite of Daghesh-forte, and shows that ל may either be doubled agreeably to the point in its bosom or not. In לֹא תִרְצֶחַ Ex. 20:13, Deut. 5:17, it is the opposite of Daghesh-lene, and shows that the ה may either have its unaspirated sound, as the Daghesh indicates, or may be aspirated. It is often referred to in the marginal Masoretic notes even where it is no longer found in the text, e. g. Judg. 16:16, 28.

### ACCENTS

§ 28. The third class of Masoretic additions to the text are those which relate to the words. These are the accents, Makkeph, Methegh, and the K'ri. An accent (טַעַם) is written upon every word with a twofold design, 1st, of marking its tone-syllable, and 2dly, of indicating its relation to other words in the sentence. The great number of the accents has respect entirely to this second function, there being no difference in the quality of the stress laid upon particular syllables, such for example as is marked by the Greek acute, grave, and circumflex, but only that difference in its amount which arises from the unequal emphasis naturally laid upon the different members of a clause or period. The punctuators have attempted not only to indicate the pauses to be made in reading, as is done by the stops in use in other languages, but to represent to the eye the precise position held

by each word in the structure of the sentence, and the various grades of attraction or repulsion arising from the relations whether co-ordinate or subordinate which subsist among them. Every sentence is fancifully regarded as a territory, which, partitioned into its several clauses, forms empires, kingdoms, and principalities, ruled by their respective sovereigns, each of whom has his own train of inferiors and dependants. The accents are accordingly divided into Disjunctives or Rulers (מְלָכִים), and Conjunctives or Servants (עֲבָדִים). The former indicate that the word upon which they are placed is more or less separated from those that follow; they mark thus the end of a clause or of the section of a clause over which they exert control. The latter indicate that the word over or under which they are written is connected with what follows and belongs to the clause or section ruled by the next succeeding Disjunctive.

*a.* The stress of voice denoted by the accent must not be confounded with quantity. An accented syllable may nevertheless be short, the energy with which it is pronounced not necessarily affecting its length.

*b.* The Jews made use of the accents as musical notes in the cantillation of the synagogue, whence they are also called נְגִינֹת. In the judgment of some this is a part, and perhaps a leading part, of their original design. Their great variety, the frequent occurrence of accents of opposite powers upon the same word, and the distinct system of poetical accents, favor this opinion. Such as are curious to know the details may find the mode of their employment for this purpose explained at length in Bartolocci Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, vol. iv. pp. 427-444.

§ 29. The Disjunctive accents may be divided into four classes of various rank or power, as follows, viz :

CLASS I. *Emperors.*

*1. Silluk	(,)	סִלּוּק:
*2. Athnah	(^)	אַתְנַח

CLASS II. *Kings.*

3. S'gholta	( <sup>*</sup> )	סגלחא postp.
4. Zakēph Kāton	( <sup>˙</sup> )	זקח קטון
5. Zakēph Gadhol	( <sup>˙</sup> )	זקח גדול
*6. Tiphhhā	( <sub>˙</sub> )	טיפחא

CLASS III. *Lukes.*

*7. R'bhī'	( <sup>˙</sup> )	רביע
*8. Shalsheth	( <sup>˙</sup> )	שלשלת
*9. Zarkā	( <sup>∞</sup> )	זרקא postp.
10. Pashta	( <sup>˘</sup> )	פשטא postp.
11. Y'thīb	( <sub>˘</sub> )	יתיב prep.
12. T'bhīr	( <sub>˙</sub> )	תביר

CLASS IV. *Counts.*

*13. Pāzēr	( <sup>˘</sup> )	פזר
14. Karnē Phārā	( <sup>˘˘</sup> )	קרני פרה
15. T'līshā Gh'dholā	( <sup>˙</sup> )	תלישא גדולה prep.
16. Geresh	( <sup>˘</sup> )	גרש
17. G'rāshayim	( <sup>˘˘</sup> )	גרשאים
*18. P'sīk	( <sup>˙</sup> )	פסיק

The Conjunctive accents, or *Servants*, are the following,  
viz :

*19. Merkā	( <sub>˙</sub> )	מרקא
*20. Mūnāhh	( <sub>˘</sub> )	מונח
21. Merkā Kh'phūla	( <sub>˙˙</sub> )	מרקא כפולה
*22. Mahpakh	( <sub>˘˘</sub> )	מהפך
23. Dargā	( <sub>˙</sub> )	דרגא
*24. Kadh mā	( <sup>˘</sup> )	קדמא
*25. Yerāhh ben Yōmō	( <sub>˘˙</sub> )	ירח בן יום
26. T'līshā K'tannā	( <sup>˙</sup> )	תלישא קטנה postp.

a. Merka Kh'phula has sometimes been reckoned among the Disjunctives, as by Gesenius in his *Lehrgebäude*; but the absence of Dagheshele in the word following that on which it stands in Ex. 5:15, Ezek. 14:4, proves that it is a Conjunctive.

b. According to their most probable significations, the names of the accents appear to be in part borrowed from their forms and in part from their uses. Thus the Disjunctives: Silluk, *end*; Athnahh, *rest*; Segholta, *bunch of grapes*; Zakeph, small and great, *causing suspension*; Tiphhha, *palm of the hand*; R'bhi<sup>a</sup>, *square or reposing*; Shalsheth, *chain*; Zarka, *dispersion*; Pashta, *expansion or letting down* (the voice); Y'thibh, *sitting still*; T'bhir, *interruption*; Pazer, *separator*; Karne Phara, *a heifer's horns*; T'lisha, great and small, *shield*; Geresh, *expulsion*; G'rashayim, *double Geresh*; P'sik, *cut off*. Conjunctives: Merka, *prolonging*; Munahh, (a trumpet) *at rest*, i. e., in its proper position; Merka Kh'phula, *double Merka*; Mahpakh, (a trumpet) *inverted*; Darga, *progress*; Kadhma, *beginning*; Yerahh ben-Yomo, *moon a day old*.

Other names are given to some of these accents, particularly where they occur in certain situations or combinations; thus Tiphhha is also called Tarhha (תַּרְחָה), Munahh with P'sik is called L'gharmeh (לְגַרְמֵה), etc.

c. The classification of the Disjunctives, according to their respective powers and the laws of their consecution, has been the work of Christian writers, from whom all accurate investigations of the accentual system have proceeded. In fact, this whole subject is treated by the Jewish grammarians in the crudest and most perplexed manner. Buxtorf says, in his *Thesaurus Grammaticus*, p. 45: *Accentuum ratio hactenus nec a quocquam nostrorum nec ab ipsis etiam Hebraeis sufficienter explicata est*. The division exhibited above is the one now commonly adopted. The current names, Imperatores, Reges, Duces, Comites, are those used by Wasmuth in his *Institutio Accent. Heb.* 1664. Others have divided them differently. The learned Pfeiffer, author of the *Dubiâ Vexata*, distinguishes one Emperor, one Archduke, four Dukes, seven Counts, and five Barons. Boston, the well-known author of the *Fourfold State*, in an elaborate Latin treatise upon this subject left by him in manuscript and published shortly after his death, distributes them into three classes of superior and one of inferior rank. Mention is made, in a commendatory preface by Mill, the distinguished critic of the New Testament, of another manuscript in English, in which Boston applied his views practically in a twofold translation of the first twenty-three chapters of Genesis, with copious notes, both philological and theological. This, it is believed, has never been published. A curious little book upon the Canon by Ferdinand Parkhurst, London, 1660, makes six Regal and ten Principal Disjunctives Y'thibh and P'sik being omitted altogether.

§ 30. 1. Fourteen of the accents are written over, and eleven under, the words to which they are attached. P'sik, whose only use is to modify the power of other accents, is written after the word to which it belongs, and in the same line



with it. The place of the accents is either over or under the letter preceding the tone-vowel, with the exception of the prepositives Y'thibh and T'lisha Gh'dhola, which always accompany the initial letter of the word, and the postpositives S'gholta, Zarka, Pashta, and T'lisha K'tanna, which stand upon the final letter. Y'thibh is only used when the first is the tone-syllable. Pashta is repeated if the word on which it stands is accented on the penult, e. g. וְהָיָה Gen. 1 : 2, or ends with two vowelless letters, e. g. וַיִּשָּׂא Ruth 3 : 7, or if the last letter has Pattahh furtive, e. g. וַיִּלֶּךְ Gen. 33 : 13, and in some manuscripts and editions there is a like repetition of S'gholta and Zarka. When a word bears the other prepositive or postpositives, there is nothing to mark its tone-syllable unless this may chance to be the one upon which the nature of the accent in question requires it to be placed.

2. Silluk has the same form as Methegh, § 44 ; but the former invariably stands on the tone-syllable of the last word in the verse, while Methegh is never written under a tone-syllable. Pashta is likewise distinguished from Kadhma only by its position upon the last letter of the word, and after the superscribed vowel, if there be one, e. g. וַיִּשָּׂא Gen. 1 : 7, מִלְאָכֹה Gen. 24 : 7, while Kadhma is placed upon the letter preceding the tone-vowel, e. g. וַיִּשָּׂר Gen. 2 : 19 : where this chances to be a final letter the laws of consecution only can decide ; thus, in וַיִּרְעֶה Gen. 26 : 4, צִאֲתָהּ Deut. 16 : 3, the accent is Pashta, but in וַיִּזְרַעְהָ Gen. 17 : 8, צִאֲתָהּ 1 Sam. 29 : 6, it is Kadhma. Y'thibh is distinguished from Mahpakh by being written under the first letter of the word and taking precedence of its vowel if this be subscribed, e. g. עָשָׂב Gen. 1 : 11, בָּרִי Gen. 31 : 6, Deut. 10 : 17 ; Mahpakh belongs under the consonant which precedes the tone-vowel, and after its vowel-sign if this be subscribed, e. g. וַיִּקְרֶה Gen. 2 : 14, בָּרִי Gen. 32 : 33, Deut. 4 : 7. When the initial syllable bears the tone and there is no subscribed vowel, the laws of consecution must decide ; thus, in וַיִּהְיֶה the accent is Y'thibh in Gen.



3:15, 44:17; Deut. 10:17; but Mahpakh in Josh. 17:1.

§ 31. The accents already explained are called the prosaic accents, and are found in all the books of the Old Testament with the exception of the Psalms (תְּהִלִּים), Proverbs (מִשְׁלֵי), and the poetic portion of Job (אֵיּוֹב), whose initials form the technical word אֲמָתָה. Here a different system of accentuation prevails. Thirteen of the prosaic accents, one-half of the whole number, nowhere occur in the books just named, viz.: S'gholta, Zakeph-Katon, and Zakeph-Gadhol of the Kings, Pashta, Y'thibh, and T'bhir of the Dukes, Karne Phara, T'lisha Gh'dhola, Geresh, and G'rashayim, of the Counts, Merka Kh'phula, Darga, and T'lisha K'tanna of the Con-junctives. Such as are common to both systems are in the previous table distinguished by an asterisk. The powers of some of these, however, are altered, so that a new arrangement of them is necessary; and they are supplemented by additional signs formed by combining the prosaic accents or assigning them unusual positions. The scale of the poetical or metrical accents thus constituted is as follows, viz.:

#### DISJUNCTIVE ACCENTS.

##### *Class I.*

1. Silluk	(˙)	הַפְּקוּדִי
2. Athnahh	(,)	הַפְּקוּדִי
3. Merka-Mahpakh	(,˘)	הַפְּקוּדִי

##### *Class II.*

4. R'bhi <sup>a</sup>	(˘)	הַפְּקוּדִי
5. Pazer	(˘˘)	הַפְּקוּדִי
6. R'bhi <sup>a</sup> Geresh	(˘˘)	הַפְּקוּדִי
7. Tiphhha initial	(,)	הַפְּקוּדִי prep.
8. Zarka	(˘˘)	הַפְּקוּדִי postp.
9. P'sik	(,)	הַפְּקוּדִי postp.

## CONJUNCTIVE ACCENTS.

10. Merka	(,)	הַפְּכוּר
11. Merka-Zarka	(, ^)	הַפְּכוּר
12. Mahpakh	(<)	הַפְּכוּר
13. Mahpakh-Zarka	(< ^)	הַפְּכוּר
14. Munahh	(,)	הַפְּכוּר
15. Munahh superior	(^)	הַפְּכוּר
16. Yerahh ben Yomo	(, v)	הַפְּכוּר
17. Kadhma	(, ')	הַפְּכוּר
18. Tiphhha	(, \)	הַפְּכוּר
19. Shalsheth	(, ^')	הַפְּכוּר

*a.* It will be perceived that there are fewer Disjunctives but more Conjunctives than are exhibited by the prosaic accents. Merka-Mahpakh answers substantially to S'gholta; R'hbi<sup>a</sup>-Geresh to Tiphhha before Silluk, and Tiphhha initial to Tiphhha before Athnahh. Tiphhha and Shalsheth are transferred from the list of Disjunctives to that of the Conjunctives, whence it comes to pass that if a word bearing either of these accents terminates in a vowel, Daghesh-lene will not be inserted in a following initial aspirate, e. g. עֲשֵׂה בְּכֶעֶס Ps. 31:10, מְבֹרָא פְּהִיחִים Prov. 8:3, יְהִפְשֵׁט בְּמִזְמוֹת Ps. 10:2.

*b.* P'sik, in the poetic as in the prosaic accents, is never used alone but always in conjunction with another accent. It serves to strengthen Disjunctives and to reduce the power of Conjunctives without disturbing the order of their consecution. It is thus used with Merka-Mahpakh Ps. 5:13, Pazer Ps. 10:14, Tiphhha initial Ps. 31:4, Mahpakh Ps. 5:9, Munahh Prov. 1:22, Merka Ps. 10:13, Kadhma Ps. 10:5, Shalsheth Ps. 7:6.

## POSITION OF THE ACCENT

§ 32. The accent in Hebrew may fall either upon the ultimate or the penultimate syllable, but never at a greater remove from the end of the word. In the former case words are technically termed Milra (מִלְרָע *from below*), and in the latter Milēl (מִלְעִיל *from above*).

1. The position of the accent may be considered in relation either to the syllabic or to the etymological structure of a word, that is to say, as affected by the nature of its syllables on the one hand or of the elements of which it is composed as a significant part of speech on the other. It is so far determined by the syllabic structure of words, that a long mixed syllable or a short simple syllable, whether in the ultimate or the penultimate, must receive the accent, § 18. 2. thus: *לִרְבֹּה*, *שָׁרָה*, *וּתְעַמְדָּנָה*, *וַיִּצְחָק*.

2. Considered in reference to their etymological structure, words exist in two conditions, (1.) their primary uninflected state, by which their essential and proper meaning is conveyed; (2.) with added affixes and prefixes, by which that meaning is variously modified. In their nude or primary state all words, whether primitives or derivatives, are accented upon the ultimate, and so continue to whatever flexion, involving no terminational appendages, they may be subjected. Thus, *זָכָרוֹן*; *הִתְפַּקֵּד*, *וַיִּפְקֹד*, *פָּקֵד*, *פָּקֵד*, *פָּקֵד*, *פָּקֵד*, *פָּקֵד*; *כְּנַעֲנִי*; *יִזְמֵם*; *אַרְגָּמָן*; *מִדְבָּר*, *מִדְבָּר*; *זִכְרוֹן*.

3. The only exception is a class of words called Segholates, in which the last vowel does not belong originally or essentially to the form, but is introduced for the sake of softening the pronunciation, § 61. 2; these are accented on the penultimate, as *לֶגֶל*, *לֶגֶל*, *כְּתוּבָה*, *תּוֹהוּ*, *בֵּית*, *נִצֵּחַ*, *סֶפֶר*, *מֶלֶךְ*; *רִשְׁתֹּהוּ*.

*a.* *נִעְמְדָה* Is. 50: 8 is said to be the only instance of a word accented on the antepenult. The proper tone-syllable of this word is the ultimate, but upon the recession of the accent by § 35, the vowel next preceding, which has arisen from Sh'va and is unessential to the form, cannot receive it, so that it necessarily falls upon the one still further back.

§ 33. The additions which words may receive at the beginning or end affect the accent in proportion to the respective weight accorded to them. Additions to the end of words are of two sorts, which may be distinguished as affixes and suffixes. Affixes are so welded to the word or merged in it



suffixes נִי, נָה, נִי, תִי, תָה, מוֹ, מָה, or the verbal affixes תִּי, תָה, מוֹ, מָה, will not alter the position of the accent provided it originally stood upon the ultimate; if, however, its original place was the penult, or if the syllable in question be attached to the word by a union vowel, the accent must be carried forward one syllable to prevent its standing on the antepenult, which is never admissible: כָּסֶה, כָּסְהוּ, כָּסְמוֹ, כָּסְתָנִי; מָאֵס, מָאֲסֶה, מָאֲסָנִי; קָלָה, קָלָתִי, קָלָתְךָ, קָלָתְךָ. Suffixes appended to a word ending with a consonant mostly require a connecting vowel, and consequently shift the position of the accent. Affixes, by reason of the less weight accorded to them, commonly do not. The suffix תִּי follows the general rule when preceded by a union vowel, but draws the accent upon itself when it is not, e. g. יָדָה, יָדָהּ, יָדָהּ, יָדָהּ. A consonantal appendage to a long unaccented vowel, inasmuch as it converts the ultimate into a mixed syllable, necessarily draws the accent upon it from the penult, § 32. 1, e. g. מָאֲסָנִי, מָאֲסָנִי, מָאֲסָנִי; רְמִיזָה, רְמִיזָה, רְמִיזָה, רְמִיזָה.

3. A mixed syllable, whether an affix as תָּם, תָּן, or suffix as כָּם, כָּן, תָּה, תָּה, will attract the accent to itself, הִלְכָתָם from הִלְכָה; מִלְכָּם, מִלְכָּם, מִלְכָּם; הָרִים from הָרִים. In the unusual form כָּלָהם 2 Sam. 23 : 6, the accent stands upon the union vowel.

4. The only prefixes which exercise any influence upon the position of the accent, are the Vav conversive of the future, which draws back the accent from a mixed ultimate to a simple penult, וְיֵשֶׁב, וְיֵשֶׁב, וְיֵשֶׁב; and the Vav conversive of the preterite, which throws it forward from the penult to a simple ultimate, וְשָׁבַת, וְשָׁבַת, וְשָׁבַת, וְשָׁבַת.

a. Some languages invariably accent the same part of the word; thus, Bohemian and Lettish the initial syllable, Polish and Lazian, one of the Caucasian tongues, the penult of all polysyllables. Others, in which more freedom is allowed, have no respect to the etymological structure of words, but are guided entirely by the character of their syllables. Thus, in Arabic and Latin words are accented according to the quantity of the penult; the accent is given to the penult if it is long, to the antepenult

if the penult is short. In others still the etymological principle is the prevailing one, and this often has a wider scope than in Hebrew. Thus, in Greek the accent has the range of the last three syllables. In Sanscrit it may stand upon any syllable whatever even of the longest words. In English it is almost equally free, e. g. *péremptorily*, *inconsiderátion*, its removal from its primary position upon the radical portion of the word being conditioned by the respective weight of the formative syllables appended, e. g. *pérson*, *pérsonate*, *pérsonally*, *persónify*, *personálicity*, *personificátion*.

§ 34. The location of the accent being thus influenced by the etymological structure of words, it may serve to distinguish words of like appearance but different formation. Thus, מָחָה Gen. 30 : 1, בָּאָה Gen. 29 : 6, are participles, but מָחָה Gen. 35 : 18, בָּאָה Gen. 29 : 9, are preterites, the feminine affix receiving the accent in one case but not in the other, § 33. 1. So בָּנוּ *they built* from בָּנָה, but בָּנוּ *in us*; שָׁבוּ *they carried captive* from שָׁבָה, but שָׁבוּ *they returned* from שׁוּב; אָחַז *he has seized*, but אָחַז Job 23 : 9 *I shall see* from חָזָה; יָרַע *it shall be evil* from רָעָה, יָרַע *he shall feed* from רָעָה; מָרָה *he was rebellious*, מָרָה *it was bitter* from מָר; קוּמִי *arise thou* (fem.), קוּמִי *my rising up*.

§ 35. The position of the accent may be shifted from the following causes, viz. :

1. A Conjunctive is frequently removed from the ultimate to the penult if a Disjunctive immediately follows, whether upon a monosyllable or a dissyllable accented on the penult, in order to prevent the unpleasant concurrence of two accented syllables in closely connected words, e. g. קָרָא לְיִלְהָ Gen. 1 : 5, בָּנָה לְיִרָ Gen. 4 : 17, אָזְלָה לְיָ Deut. 32 : 36, וְהִתְאַבְּדוּ לְיָהּ Ps. 2 : 12, לָתֵת לְיָ Isa. 36 : 8. In a few exceptional cases the secondary accent Methegh remains to mark the original tone-syllable, after the principal accent has been thrown back, קָנוּ לְבַעַר קָנוּ Num. 24 : 22, נָבַל צִיץ Isa. 40 : 7, הִשְׁמַע עִם Deut. 4 : 33.

2. The special emphasis given to the last word of a clause or section, and represented by what are called the



pause accents, § 36, 2, *a*, is sometimes rendered more distinct by a change of the accented syllable from the ultimate to the penult, e. g. אֲנֹכִי, אֲנֹכִי; אֲתָה, אֲתָה; עֲתָה, עֲתָה; כָּלֹךְ, כָּלֹךְ; or from the penult to the ultimate, particularly in the case of forms with Vav conversive of the future וַיִּגְלֶה, וַיִּגְלֶה; so וַיִּנְגֵּם, וַיִּנְגֵּם, וַיִּאֲמַר. The accent is in a few instances attracted to a short final syllable ending in a weak letter, which either loses its sound entirely, converting the syllable into a simple one, or requires considerable effort and energy of voice to make it distinctly heard, e. g. יִרְאָה Gen. 41 : 33 for יִרְאָה; so תִּרְאָה Zech. 9 : 5, Mic. 7 : 10, הִשָּׁע Ps. 39 : 14 for הִשָּׁע.

#### CONSECUTION OF ACCENTS IN PROSE.

§ 36. 1. The second use of the accents is to point out the relation of words to one another. The Disjunctives indicate a greater or less separation between the word on which they stand and the following one; the Conjunctives indicate a connection. The greatest separation of all is effected by Silluk, which is written under the last word of every verse, and is followed invariably by two dots vertically placed (:), called Sōph Pāsūk (סוף פסוק *end of the verse*). The next in power are Athnahh and S'gholta. When a verse was to be divided into two clauses, Athnahh was placed under the last word of the first clause, Silluk maintaining its position at the end of the verse. If it was to be divided into three clauses, which is the greatest number that any verse can have, the last word of the first clause receives S'gholta, the last word of the second Athnahh, and the last of all Silluk. Verses of one clause range from Gen. 26 : 6, containing three words, to such as Jer. 13 : 13 and 1 Chron. 28 : 1, containing more than twenty: the most common division is into two clauses, e. g. Gen. 1 : 1 : הָאָרֶץ . . . אֱלֹהִים; three clauses



are much less frequent, Gen. 1 : 7 : **בֵּן** : **לְרִקִּיעַ** . . . **הָרִקִּיעַ**  
23 : 16, 24 : 30, 26 : 28.

*a.* In Job 1 : 8 S'gholta occurs in a verse of two clauses without Athnahn, probably because the accentuation is conformed to that of Job 2 : 3.

2. Each of these clauses is capable of subdivision to whatever extent its length or character may seem to demand by the Disjunctives Zakeph Katon, Zakeph Gadhol, R'bhi<sup>a</sup>, Pazer, and T'lisha Gh'dhola, according to the number of sections to be made and the various degrees of their completeness. Thus, in Josh. 1 : 8 the clause of Athnahn is divided into five sections, **וְיָמִישׁ . . . מִפִּיָּה . . . לְיָהוָה . . . לַעֲשׂוֹת . בִּי**, in 2 Kin. 1 : 6 into six, **אֵלֶּיךָ . . . יְהוָה . . . בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל . שְׁלַח לְדָרֶשׁ . . . עֲקָרֶיךָ**. The choice of the accent to govern a particular section depends not only upon its power, but likewise upon its rank, the more exalted officer standing in ordinary cases nearer the sovereign. Accordingly toward the beginning of a clause an inferior Disjunctive will be used, even though the separation is such as would require an accent of much higher power to indicate it in a more advanced portion of the same clause. These accents, moreover, have not a fixed value like the stops in other languages; their power is not absolute but relative, and varies endlessly with the circumstances of the case. Athnahn in Gen. 1 : 1 marks the greatest division in the verse, but that is not sufficient to require a comma. In the next verse Zakeph Katon is equal to a semicolon in the first clause and less than a comma in the second. In Gen. 27 : 16 the separation indicated by R'bhi<sup>a</sup> is wholly rhythmical.

*a.* Those accents which, as above described, mark the limits of clauses and sections, are denominated pause accents.

§ 37. In the sections thus created the accents are disposed relatively to the Disjunctive which marks its close. Each ruler has his servant and subordinate officer, whose

function it is to wait upon him. In other words, each Disjunctive is regularly preceded by a particular Conjunctive and inferior Disjunctive; and the train of accents in each section is formed by arranging the Disjunctives in their fixed order of succession with or without their regular Conjunctives until all its words are supplied. The trains proper to the different sections are shown in the following table :

PRIMARY SECTIONS.	DISJUNCTIVES. CLASS I.	CONJUNCTIVES.	DISJUNCTIVES. CLASS II.	CONJUNCTIVES.	DISJUNCTIVES. CLASS III.	CONJUNCTIVES.	DISJUNCTIVES. CLASS IV.	CONJUNCTIVES.
	· 1	,	}	,( „ s)	”	,( ) ’ ( ) <sup>9</sup>	}	’ ( ) <sup>9</sup> ( ) „
	^	^						
			^	„ ( )	2	„ ( ) ’ ( ) <sup>9</sup>		
SECONDARY SECTIONS.			:	„	’ ( )	^ ( ) ’ ( ) <sup>9</sup>	}	
			^					
						„ μ ( s ) μ ( )	}	}
UNUSUAL SECTIONS.					3 1		9 8	μ μ μ μ μ μ

*a.* Accents of like forms are readily distinguishable in the table by the column in which they stand. Where perspicuity requires it the distinction will hereafter be made by appending their initial letters, thus: Kadhma <sup>ᵏ</sup>, Pashta <sup>ᵖ</sup>, Mahpakh <sup>ᵐ</sup>, Y'thibh <sup>ᵞ</sup>.

§ 38. *Explanation of the Table.*—The trains preceding the three principal accents are exhibited in the horizontal lines of the uppermost division; those of the ordinary dependent sections in the middle division, and those of rare occurrence at the bottom.

1. *Train of Silluk.*—If Silluk be immediately preceded by a Conjunctive, it will be Merka; if a Disjunctive precede it in the same section, with or without an intervening Merka, it will be Tiphhha, Gen. 1 : 1. If there be a Conjunctive before Tiphhha, it will be Merka, Gen. 1 : 1; if two Conjunctives, which occurs but fourteen times, they will be Merka Kh'phula and Darga, Gen. 27 : 25, Lev. 10 : 1, 2 Chron. 20 : 30. The next Disjunctive before Tiphhha, in the same section, will be T'bhir, Gen. 1 : 4. If T'bhir be preceded by one Conjunctive, it will be Darga, Gen. 1 : 12, or Merka, Gen. 1 : 26; if by two, the second will be Kadhma, 1 Sam. 15 : 33, or Munahh, Gen. 2 : 4; and if by three, the third will be T'lisha K'tanna, Gen. 2 : 19. The next Disjunctive before T'bhir, in the same section, will be Geresh, Gen. 26 : 11, 27 : 4, or G'rashayim, Ex. 23 : 4. If Geresh be preceded by one Conjunctive, it will be Kadhma, Gen. 24 : 7, or Munahh, Isa. 60 : 17; if by a second, it will be T'lisha K'tanna, Gen. 2 : 5, or Munahh with P'sik, Gen. 28 : 9; if by a third, it will be Munahh, 1 Sam. 14 : 34; if by a fourth, it will also be Munahh, Deut. 1 : 19.

*a.* The parentheses of the table contain alternate accents. Thus, Merka is substituted for Darga and for Mahpakh (before Pashta in the clause of Zakeph Katon) if no more than one vowel intervenes between the Conjunctive and the king which it precedes, e. g. Gen. 1 : 22, Gen. 1 : 24, 26; Gen. 5 : 17, Deut. 1 : 2, 35. Munahh is also regularly substituted for Kadhma, whenever the accent stands on the initial letter of the word, Gen. 25 : 8, Gen. 19 : 35; 1 Kin. 19 : 7, Deut. 1 : 28; Gen. 19 : 12;

Eccl. 5 : 7. G'rashayim takes the place of Geresh provided the accent is on the ultimate and it is not preceded by Kadhma either on the same or the previous word, Ex. 16 : 23, 36 : 3. When two accents are included in a parenthesis the meaning is that if an additional accent is required, these two will take the place of the one before the parenthesis. P'sik has no separate place in the consecution, but is joined with the other accents to modify their power. It is constantly associated with the Disjunctive Shalshleth to add to its strength, and occasionally with the different Conjunctives to reduce their strength, but without disturbing the order of their consecution, e. g. with Merka Ex. 16 : 5, Munahh Gen. 46 : 2, Mahpakh Ex. 30 : 34, Kadhma Lev. 11 : 32, Darga Gen. 42 : 13, T'lisha K'tanna 1 Sam. 12 : 3.

2. *Train of Athnahh*.—If Athnahh be preceded by a Conjunctive, it will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 1 ; if by a Disjunctive in its own section, it will be Tiphha, Gen. 1 : 1. The accents which precede Tiphha have already been mentioned in explaining the train of Silluk.

3. *Train of S'gholta*.—The first Conjunctive before S'gholta will be Munahh, Gen. 3 : 3 ; if there be two, the second will be Munahh, Lev. 8 : 31, or Merka, Gen. 3 : 14. The first Disjunctive in its section will be Zarka, Gen. 1 : 28 ; and if this be preceded by one Conjunctive, it will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 7, or Merka, 1 Chron. 5 : 18 ; if by two, the second will be Kadhma, Gen. 30 : 16, 31 : 32 ; if by three, the second will be Munahh and the third Kadhma, Lev. 4 : 35. The next Disjunctive before Zarka will be Geresh, Gen. 24 : 7, or G'rashayim, Ex. 39 : 3. The accents preceding these have been explained in 1.

4. *Train of Zakeph Katon*.—The first Conjunctive before Zakeph Katon will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 2, the second likewise Munahh, Gen. 27 : 45. The first Disjunctive will be Pashta, Gen. 1 : 2 ; or, if the proper place of the accent be the first letter of the word, Y'thibh, Gen. 1 : 11, 2 : 11. The first Conjunctive before Pashta will be Mahpakh, Gen. 1 : 9, or Merka, Gen. 1 : 2 ; the second, Kadhma, Gen. 39 : 19, or Munahh, Gen. 1 : 12 ; the third will be T'lisha K'tanna, Ezr. 3 : 11. The Disjunctive before Pashta will be

Geresh, Gen. 1 : 24, or G'rashayim, Gen. 1 : 11 ; the further consecution is explained in 1.

*a.* In some instances Pashta is found not in the train of Zakeph Katon, but seeming to govern an independent section, e. g. Ex. 29 : 20, Deut. 9 : 6, Josh. 10 : 11, 2 Sam. 14 : 7, 2 Chron. 18 : 23.

5. Zakeph Gadhol is mostly used instead of Zakeph Katon when no other accent precedes it in its own section, whether upon the same word or one before it : אֶדָּה בְּשֶׁרֶךְ Gen. 9 : 4 (in some editions), in which it is preceded by Munahh, is exceptional.

6. *Train of R'bhi<sup>a</sup>.*—The first Conjunctive before R'bhi<sup>a</sup> will be Munahh, Gen. 1 : 9 ; the second, Munahh commonly with P'sik, Gen. 2 : 5, or Darga, Gen. 6 : 15 ; the third, Munahh with P'sik, Gen. 7 : 23, 31 : 29, or Merka, Ex. 14 : 10. The Disjunctive before R'bhi<sup>a</sup> will be Geresh, Ex. 16 : 3, or G'rashayim, Deut. 1 : 11, which are preceded as in 1.

7. *Train of Pazer.*—Pazer may be preceded by one Munahh, 1 Sam. 14 : 34, by two, Ezek. 9 : 2, by three, 1 Sam. 14 : 34, or by four, Isa. 66 : 20.

8. *Train of T'lisha Gh'dhola.*—T'lisha Gh'dhola is the weakest of the Disjunctives which are ever set to rule independent sections. Its weakness is in fact such, that it is sometimes drawn into the section of a stronger Disjunctive ; thus, in Gen. 1 : 12, Lev. 4 : 7, 1 Sam. 17 : 51, Isa. 9 : 5, Neh. 5 : 18, it takes the place of T'lisha K'tanna among the antecedents of Pashta, standing between it and Geresh or G'rashayim ; in Gen. 13 : 1, 21 : 14, Deut. 26 : 12, it stands similarly between T'bhir and Geresh or G'rashayim. And in many cases, perhaps in most, when it rules a section of its own, this is a mere subsection, not so much a division of one of the principal clauses as a fragment broken off from one of the larger sections at a point where T'lisha K'tanna would have stood had the connection been sufficiently close

to require a Conjunctive, e. g. Gen. 19 : 2, 1 Kin. 20 : 28. That this is not always so appears, however, from examples like 2 Sam. 14 : 32, Gen. 7 : 7, Isa. 66 : 19, Jer. 39 : 5, and particularly Gen. 31 : 52, where **וְאִם-לֹא־תִּהְיֶה** corresponds to the preceding **אִם-לֹא־יִהְיֶה**. T'lisha Gh'dhola may be preceded by one Munahh, Gen. 27 : 46, by two, Josh. 2 : 1, by three, or by four, 1 Kin. 2 : 5.

9. Shalshleth occurs but seven times, viz., Gen. 19 : 16, 24 : 12, 39 : 8, Lev. 8 : 23, Isa. 13 : 8, Am. 1 : 2, Ezr. 5 : 12, and in every instance stands upon the initial word of the verse, and is accompanied by P'sik. It has consequently no antecedents.

10. Karne Phara is only used sixteen times. Its section never contains less than three words : its immediate predecessor is always Yerahh ben Yomo, to which may be added one Munahh, Num. 35 : 5, Neh. 5 : 13, 13 : 5, 2 Chron. 24 : 5 ; two, 2 Kin. 10 : 5, Jer. 38 : 25, Est. 7 : 9, Neh. 1 : 6, 2 Chron. 35 : 7 ; three, Josh. 19 : 51, 2 Sam. 4 : 2, Jer. 13 : 13 ; four, 1 Chron. 28 : 1 ; or five, Ezek. 48 : 21.

§ 39. 1. The complete trains of the several accents contain one Disjunctive from each of the inferior orders, disposed in due succession of rank, with one Conjunctive immediately preceding the first class of Disjunctives, two Conjunctives preceding the second class, three the third class, four or more the fourth class. These trains are adapted to sections of different length and character by omitting such of the Conjunctives, and more rarely by repeating such of the Disjunctives, as the mutual relations of the words may seem to require, and breaking off the series as soon as every word in the section is supplied. Thus, while the general order of consecution is fixed and invariable, there is the utmost liberty and variety in particular cases.

*a.* In a very few instances the Conjunctives go beyond the number here assigned. Thus, Athnahh is preceded by two Munahhs in Ex. 3 : 4,



and, according to some editions, in Isa. 48:11. T'bhîr is preceded by four Conjunctives, Josh. 10:11, 2 Chron. 22:11, Isa. 66:20; Pashta by four, Ex. 5:8, 2 Kin. 5:1, and even by five, Josh. 19:51.

2. If a section consists of but a single word, this will receive the appropriate Disjunctive, the entire antecedent series of the table being then omitted as unnecessary; thus, Silluk וְיָמָה Gen. 5:5; Athnahh וַיֵּצֵא־ Gen. 24:34; Zakeph Katon וַיִּבְנֶנָּה Isa. 1:30; R'bhî וְהַיְמִיִּם Gen. 7:19; Pazer וַיֵּצֵא־ Gen. 22:2; T'lisha Gh'dhola וְקָ Gen. 19:8. This, as has been already said, is the regular length of the sections of Zakeph Gadhol and Shalshleth; but those of S'gholta are never composed of less than two words, and those of Karne Phara never of less than three.

3. In sections of greater length there is a disposition towards a regular alternation of Disjunctives and Conjunctives upon successive words, e. g. Gen. 23:11 : , , , , , Gen. 24:7 " " " " " , and consequently though two or more Conjunctives may be allowed before a particular Disjunctive, only the first of these is in the majority of cases employed. The actual relations of words may, however, so interfere with this regularity as on the one hand to cause the intervening Conjunctives to be dropped entirely, e. g. Gen. 1:22 " " " " " 1 Chron. 15:18 " " " " " , or, on the other, to introduce as many Conjunctives as the table will admit, e. g. Gen. 3:14 " " " " " . But if either of the three primary sections consist of but two words, the first must have a Disjunctive accent, however close its relation may be to the second, e. g. וַיֵּצֵא־ Gen. 9:20, וַיִּבְנֶנָּה Gen. 3:5, וַיֵּצֵא־ Gen. 19:4.

a. In Gen. 24:15, where, however, editions differ, Silluk is in a section of two words immediately preceded by Merka.

b. Sometimes an excluded term of the series will take the place of the secondary accent Methegh, § 44. Tiphbha is thus five times written upon the same word with Silluk, e. g. Nûr 15:21, and eleven times with



Athnakh, e. g. Num. 28:26. Munakh, Gen. 21:17, for which Kadhma is sometimes substituted, Gen. 18:21, often stands upon the same word with Zakeph Katon. Kadhma is also joined in this manner with Munakh, Lev. 10:12, Merka, Judg. 21:21, Neh. 12:44, Mahpakh, Lev. 25:46, and Geresh, Ex. 16:15, 21:22, 35. Mahpakh with Munakh, Lam. 4:9.

4. Occasionally a subordinate Disjunctive or its alternate is repeated in the same section with or without its antecedents. Thus, T'bhir, Deut. 26:2 וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁכְּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ חָמָּה, so Deut. 30:20, 1 Sam. 20:21, 2 Kin. 17:36. Zarka, 2 Kin. 1:16 וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁכְּנוּ בְּאֶרֶץ חָמָּה, so ver. 6, Gen. 42:21, Jer. 21:4, Neh. 2:12. Pashta, Gen. 24:14, 42, 48, 65; 1 Kin. 20:9. Pashta, Pashta and Y'thibh, 2 Kin. 10:30, Ezr. 7:25. Geresh and G'rashayim, Gen. 28:9.

a. There is a double accentuation of part of Gen. 35:22, and of the entire decalogue, both in Ex. 20:2-17, and Deut. 5:6-21, which involves a double vocalization in certain words, e. g. פָּנִי Ex. 20:3, i. e. either פָּנִי or פָּנִי. Single words also occur with alternative accents, e. g. with G'rashayim or Geresh and T'lisha Gh'dhola וְהָיָה Gen. 5:29, וְהָיָה Lev. 10:4, וְהָיָה 2 Kin. 17:13, וְהָיָה Ezek. 48:10, וְהָיָה Zeph. 2:15.

## POETIC CONSECUTION.

§ 40. 1. The principle of the consecution is the same in the poetic as in the prosaic accents, although there is considerable diversity in the details. There is a like division of verses into clauses and sections ruled by a Disjunctive at the end, which imposes upon them its own special train of accents. The sections are fewer, however, and the trains shorter than in prose, on account of the greater brevity of the sentences in poetry for the most part. But this reduction is more than compensated by the new complexity arising from the latitude allowed in the choice of Conjunctives, which it seems impossible to reduce to fixed rules, and is probably to be referred to their use as musical notes for the

cantillation of the synagogue. It should be added, that the embarrassment arising from this inherent complexity of the subject is seriously aggravated by the numerous discrepancies in the different editions of the Bible, by which the true accentuation in the three poetical books is often involved in doubt and uncertainty.

*a.* In addition to availing himself of the researches of others, particularly of Nordheimer and Ewald in their discussions of this subject, the author has examined verse by verse the entire book of Proverbs and the first division of the Psalms (Ps. 1-41), as well as other selected Psalms and portions of Job. As the result, he confesses himself quite unable to disentangle the mystery; and as the only contribution he can make towards its solution he has concluded to present in detail, and in as convenient a form as possible, the facts observed, hoping that some future exploration may discover the principle of order, if any such principle there be, in this apparently inextricable confusion.

2. Verses may consist of one, two, or three clauses, distinguished by the three Disjunctives of the first class. If the verse contain but one clause, Silluk will be written upon the last word, Ps. 4 : 1 ; if it contain two clauses, the division will be made by Athnahh, Ps. 1 : 4, or by Merka-Mahpakh, Ps. 1 : 2. 3 : 3, upon the last word of the first clause ; if it contain three, the last word of the first will have Merka-Mahpakh, the last word of the second Athnahh, and the last word of the third Silluk, Ps. 1 : 1. Clauses may consist of a single section when no subdivision of them is necessary ; or they may consist of two or more sections, when the subdivision is effected by R'bhi<sup>a</sup> or Pazer, e. g. :  
 : , - - - ' Ps. 18 : 51, : , - - - - ' Prov. 1 : 10, ^ - - - ' Ps.  
 41 : 7, ^ - - - ' Ps. 7 : 6, , - - - - ' Ps. 17 : 14.



8:13. If it be preceded by three Conjunctives, they will be , Ps. 24:6  
 , Ps. 10:2 (or , Ps. 7:6), , Prov. 26:25 (or , Ps. 28:8 or  
 Prov. 29:13), , Ps. 4:8, , Prov. 3:27, . If it be preceded by  
 four Conjunctives, they will be , Ps. 39:2, , Ps. 32:5, or  
 , Ps. 3:3 (in some editions ). If it be preceded by five Con-  
 junctives, they will be , Job 32:6, 37:12 (in this latter example  
 some editions substitute a Makkeph for Merka).

If Silluk be preceded by a Disjunctive in its own section, it will be  
 R'bhi<sup>a</sup>-Geresh, Ps. 1:1, 5:3, 10. R'bhi<sup>a</sup>-Geresh may be preceded by one  
 Conjunctive, , Ps. 5:4; by two, , Ps. 8:2, or, , Ps. 31:10, 19; by three,  
 , or, , Ps. 73:4.

There are occasional deviations from the Conjunctives of the table;  
 thus, R'bhi<sup>a</sup>-Geresh is in Ps. 34:8 preceded by . In some of these  
 cases, however, editions differ in their notation of the accents. Thus, in  
 Ps. 5:7 some editions have , before Silluk, others , ; in Ps. 18:36,  
 Prov. 30:17, some have , , others , ; in Ps. 20:2 some have , , others  
 , ; in Prov. 24:8 some have , , others , , the two words being joined  
 by Makkeph. So, again, some editions have in Ps. 9:11 , before R'bhi<sup>a</sup>-  
 Geresh, in Ps. 18:44 , in Prov. 27:19 , , in Prov. 21:17 , ; while  
 other editions do not depart in these passages from the order given in the  
 table. Similar discrepancies exist in the other sections likewise.

*b. Train of Athnahh.*—Athnahh may be preceded by one Conjunctive,  
 , Ps. 5:8 (or , Prov. 8:30, 34), , Ps. 5:3 (or , Ps. 35:21, , Ps. 69:2),  
 , Prov. 23:3, , Ps. 14:3, Prov. 6:3 (or , Prov. 16:10); by two, , Ps.  
 6:8 (or , Ps. 7:17), , Prov. 28:25, Ps. 5:2 (in some editions the  
 latter example has , ), , Ps. 14:5, , Prov. 11:12, 14:21, , Ps.  
 37:1, , Prov. 8:21, , Ps. 25:16; by three, , Prov. 24:21, , Ps.  
 6:6 (or , Ps. 9:10, or , Ps. 16:10), , Ps. 10:17, , Prov.  
 8:13, , Ps. 18:50, , Ps. 10:13, , Prov. 6:27, , Ps. 72:3;  
 by four, , Prov. 3:12, , Prov. 24:16, , Ps. 34:7, , Ps.  
 32:2 (in some editions), , Prov. 1:19, , Ps. 65:2.

If Athnahh be preceded by a Disjunctive in its own section, it will be  
 Tiphhha initial, Ps. 1:6, 26:4. Tiphhha initial may be preceded by one  
 Conjunctive, , Ps. 5:6; by two, , Ps. 9:19 (or , Ps. 14:1, or , Ps.  
 16:9), , Ps. 32:11, , Ps. 35:14, 15, , Prov. 25:20; by three, ,  
 Ps. 23:6, , Ps. 27:1, , Ps. 12:5 (or , Prov. 27:14), ,  
 Ps. 9:14.

*c. Train of Merka-Mahpakh.*—Merka-Mahpakh may be preceded by  
 one Conjunctive, which is almost always Yerahh ben Yomo, Ps. 1:1

though occasionally it is, in some editions at least, Merka, Ps. 15:5, 35:10, or Mahpakh, Ps. 24:8, 31:10. If it be preceded by a Disjunctive in its own section, Zarka will be employed, Ps. 1:1, Prov. 1:11.

Zarka may be preceded by one Conjunctive, Ps. 12:7 (or, Prov. 1:22), Ps. 6:3, Ps. 12:3, Ps. 31:12; by two, Prov. 30:15 (in some editions), Ps. 24:10 (or, Ps. 13:6), Ps. 21:10, Ps. 27:2 (or, Ps. 35:26), Ps. 7:10; by three, Ps. 29:9, Ps. 31:14, Ps. 10:14; or by four, Ps. 40:6.

*d. Train of R'bbhi<sup>a</sup>.*—R'bbhi<sup>a</sup> may be preceded by one Conjunctive, Ps. 5:1, Ps. 8:2 (or, Ps. 23:4, or, Ps. 6:7), Prov. 28:22, Ps. 22:25, Ps. 11:2 (or, Ps. 5:11); by two, Prov. 8:33, Ps. 28:7 (or, Ps. 18:3), Ps. 9:7, Ps. 11:4, Ps. 26:1, Ps. 27:6 (or, Ps. 5:9), Prov. 6:22, Ps. 18:1 (or, Ps. 7:7, or, Ps. 39:5), Job 16:10; or by three, Ps. 40:7, Ps. 41:7 (or, Ps. 39:6, or, Ps. 3:8, or, Ps. 41:14), Ps. 19:14 (or, Ps. 39:12), Ps. 40:11, Prov. 24:31.

*e. Train of Pazer.*—Pazer may be preceded by one Conjunctive, Ps. 89:20 (or, Prov. 30:8), Ps. 32:5 (or, Ps. 17:14); by two, Ps. 5:10, Prov. 7:23 (or, Ps. 28:5), Ps. 13:3 (or, Prov. 27:10), Ps. 90:4, Ps. 7:6, Ps. 39:13, Ps. 11:2, Ps. 5:12; or by three, Ps. 22:35, 23:4, Prov. 23:29 (where some editions have ).

§ 42. The trains of these several accents are adjusted to sections of varying length by expedients similar to those employed with the prose accents, viz.: 1. Omitting the Conjunctives in whole or in part. 2. Repeating the Disjunctives, e. g. " Ps. 14:1, " Ps. 17:14, or their equivalents, e. g. Tiphkha initial before " Ps. 7:10, before " Ps. 9:1; " before " Ps. 18:1, before " Ps. 22:15; " before Tiphkha initial Ps. 16:17. 3. Writing two accents upon the same word, מִמְעוֹתֵיהֶם Ps. 5:11, הוֹרֵי Ps. 27:11, וְיָרָא Ps. 18:16. 4. Uniting two or more words by Makkeph, so that they require but a single accent. 5. Writing the different parts of a compound accent upon separate words; thus, Merka-Mahpakh אֲנִי אֶמְצֵל Ps. 6:3, Merka-Zarka כִּי תִפְחֵן Ps. 22:9, Mahpakh-Zarka כִּי בִאֲרֵךְ Prov. 6:3.

*a.* Sometimes when two accents are written upon the same word, one is the alternate of the other; thus, בִּצְצֹ Prov. 1:19, may be either בִּצְצֹ or בִּצְצֹ according as the accent remains in its proper position in the ultimate, or is thrown back upon the penult in consequence of the next word being accented upon its initial syllable

### MAKKEPH.

§ 43. Makkeph (מִקֵּף *joining*) is a horizontal stroke by which two, three, or even four words may be united. אֶתְּנֶנָּה, אִם-תַּעֲשֶׂה-לִּי Gen. 30:31, יֵשׁ-לִי-כֹל Gen. 33:11, וְאֶת-כָּל-אֲשֶׁר-לִי Gen. 12:20, 25:5, Ex. 20:11, עַל-כָּל-דְּבַר-פֶּשַׁע Ex. 22:8, עַל-כָּל-בְּנֵי-שָׂחָץ Job 41:26. It belongs properly to the accentual system, words which are closely related being often connected in this manner in order to obviate the necessity of unduly multiplying Conjunctive accents. Thus, the first fifteen words of Ex. 22:8 are in this manner reduced to eight. Monosyllabic particles are frequently, and some almost constantly, linked with the succeeding or preceding word, of which they may be regarded as in a manner appendages; thus, אֵל, עַל, אֵת, כָּל, אֵל, פֶּן, גַּם, נָא, etc. Examples are not wanting, however, of longer words similarly united, e. g. שְׁלֹשָׁה-עָרִים Deut. 19:15, נִפְשֵׁיהֶם-לִי 1 Kin. 17:21, אֲמַרְיָהוּ Isa. 31:4. This use of Makkeph is not to be confounded with that of the hyphen in modern languages between the members of a compound, as *self-same*, *master-builder*. Words united by Makkeph are still as separate as ever in character and signification; but they are pronounced together and are accented as though they formed but one word. Hence, whatever number of words be thus joined, the last only will receive an accent. And, as a further consequence, if a word preceding Makkeph properly ends in a long mixed syllable, this will, by the loss of the accent, be shortened, אֶתְּנֶנָּה, אֶתְּנֶנָּה, or failing this, will commonly receive the secondary accent Methegh, אֶתְּנֶנָּה, שְׁמִי-יִרְאֶה.

*a.* Tsere remains before Makkeph in *פֶּן*, *נִר*, *עֵר*, *עֵץ*; it sometimes remains and is sometimes shortened in *שֵׁם*, *שֵׁשׁ* *six*, *עַח* e. g. Gen. 16:13 *שֵׁם-יְהוָה*, but ver. 15 *שֵׁם-בְנוֹ*. It once remains according to some editions in *אֶת־* Job 41:26, a word which is three times written *אֶת* without Makkeph, Ps. 47:5, 60:2, Prov. 3:12. Comp. §19. 2, *a*.

*b.* Makkeph is occasionally found in the middle of a long word, which has been erroneously divided into two, e. g. *יִפְה־פָּה* Jer. 46:20, and perhaps *פָּקַח-קוֹיָה* Isa. 61:1. Sometimes words are thus divided without a Makkeph to unite the sundered parts, e. g. *בְּנֵי עֲלִים* Lam. 4:3, *בְּחַר בְּתִיָּהֶם* 2 Chron. 34:6, and probably *אֶהְיֶה יְהוָה* Hos. 4:18, *לְהַפֵּר פְּרוּת* Isa. 2:20. (See Dr. Alexander's Commentary on this passage.) The last two examples are plainly intended by the punctuators to be read as separate words. This might likewise be done in the preceding examples if they were pointed *בְּנֵי עֲלִים* and *בְּחַר בְּתִיָּהֶם*.

## METHEGH. .

§ 44. Methegh (*מֶתֶגֶח* *bridle*), a small perpendicular stroke under the initial letter of the syllable to which it belongs, is a secondary accent denoting a stress of voice inferior to the main accent. As this latter always has its place in Hebrew either upon the ultimate or the penult, distinctness was promoted and monotony relieved, especially in long words, by giving prominence to one or more of the antecedent syllables. There is a natural tendency to heighten the force of the accent by passing lightly over the immediately preceding syllable, this diminished force creating in its turn a new stress upon that next beyond it, and so on in alternate elevations and depressions to the beginning of the word. Agreeably to the principle just stated, Methegh regularly stands in polysyllables upon the second syllable before the accent, and again upon the fourth if the word have so many, e. g. *וּמִהֲתִיכֻלוֹת*, *מִמִּסְגְּרוֹתֵיהֶם*, *בְּתִיָּהֶם*, *וְיִצְיָאֵנִי*, *נֶאֱסָה*, *הָאָדָם*. And so upon two or more words connected by Makkeph, which are pronounced as one, e. g. *יִרְאֶה-לּוֹ* Gen. 22:8, *כִּי-אִם-לָקָחָם* 1 Sam. 21:7.

*a.* Sometimes, however, particularly when the nature of the syllables requires it, §32. 1, Methegh takes the place of the principal accent before



Makkeph irrespective of the position of the accent upon the following word, הַשְׁאֲרֵלֹו Num. 21:35, מִלְּה־הַבְּשֵׁן Num. 21:33, מִלְּה־בְּבֶלְ Jer. 34:1 וְכָל־שְׂהִיחָם Gen. 30:32, הָלֹא־זֶה 1 Sam. 21:12, כִּי־לִי Ex. 19:5.

b. It is to be observed that the position of Methegh is determined by that of the tone-syllable, not by that of the accentual sign when these are not coincident, as frequently happens with prepositives and postpositives, e. g. הָעִירֹתָיִי Deut. 4:26, הָיִירוּתֵינִי Josh. 22:27, where the tone falls on the penult, יְהוֹזָקִים Jer. 26:21, where the tone is upon the ultimate.

§ 45. The secondary accent is liable to be shifted from its normal position for the following reasons, viz. :

1. If the syllable which should receive it is mixed, it may be given in preference to an antecedent simple syllable, e. g. וְאֶשְׁתַּמְרָה 2 Sam. 22:24, וּמִהֲתַחֲלֶה Job 1:7, מִהֲתַחֲלֹנֹת Ezek. 42:5, שְׂאֵל־הָאִישׁ Gen. 43:7; or if none such precede, it may be omitted altogether, e. g. וַיִּמָּאֲסִם Jer. 33:24, הַיְזָרְעֵאֲלִי 1 Kin. 21:1, אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה Deut. 6:25.

2. It is always given to simple syllables when followed by a vocal Sh'va, whether simple or compound, or a vowel which has arisen from Sh'va, the slight pronunciation proper to the Sh'va or its derivative giving new prominence to the preceding vowel, וְאָמְרוּ, וְהָיָה, לְאִשֶּׁר, בְּשִׁקְתוֹת Gen. 30:38, וְהָרְדֹו; sometimes to intermediate syllables, § 20. 2, e. g. סִבְכִי Isa. 9:17, 10:34, עֲמָדָה Obad. ver. 11, particularly after He interrogative or when Daghes-forte has been omitted as after the article, Vav conversive, and the preposition מִן, e. g. הַמִּשְׁלַח, הַתְּשִׁלָּה, הַלְלֹו, בְּנֵירוֹת, הַצִּפְרֹהֲעִים, לְמִנְצָח, מִן; rarely and only as an exception to a mixed syllable standing in the first place before the principal accent, e. g. הַדָּשָׂא Gen. 1:11, הַבְּתִים Ex. 12:7, זֶחֶךְ 14:2.

a. It hence appears how Methegh comes to be of use in distinguishing the doubtful vowels, § 19, and to what extent it can be relied upon for this end. As it invariably accompanies the vowel of a simple syllable when followed by vocal Sh'va, it must always be found with *ā*, *ī*, and *ū* preceding Sh'va, inasmuch as this will necessarily be vocal. Initial *ū*, the unemphatic conjunction, is an exception, with which it is commonly not written, e. g. וַיִּבְרָא Gen. 6:19, וַיִּלְלָה Gen. 31:4, though it is sometimes,

e. g. וְלֹהֲבָהּ לֵי Gen. 1:18, וְשִׁבְהָ Judg. 5:12. The absence of Methegh, except in the case just mentioned, is consequently conclusive evidence of the shortness of the vowel. As, however, short vowels in intermediate syllables, and in a few rare instances even in mixed syllables, may receive Methegh, the presence of this sign does not of itself determine the vowel to be long; the ultimate decision must in this case depend on other considerations.

3. When by the operation of the preceding rule Methegh comes to stand in the first place before the accent, another Methegh is nevertheless occasionally found in the second place, the two thus standing in immediate succession, e. g. בְּמִתְּנָה Gen. 32:22, וְגִיעָלוֹ Gen. 45:25; and even three occur upon successive syllables, e. g. וּמִמְעַמְדָּהּ Isa. 22:19. But commonly where there is more than one Methegh, their position relatively to each other is governed by the same rules as the position of Methegh generally with relation to the principal accent, e. g. וְהַשְׁבֵּהָ, לִישׁוּעָהּ, וְאַחֲרֵיהָ, מִהֲפֹתָיו.

4. Methegh is sometimes written under a letter with Sh'va, e. g. שְׁלֹחֵיָא Job 1:11, 2:5, דְּעִירֵאֵלָיו Job 19:6, נִנְתָּקָהּ Ps. 2:3, כְּמִהַפְּלֹתָ Jer. 49:18, בְּמִעֵי Ruth 1:11.

a. A Methegh so situated is called Gayā (גַּיָּא *bellowing*) by Jewish grammarians, and, according to Elias Levita, it occurs eighty-four times, the number yielded by its name arithmetically reckoned. Methegh upon a short vowel before a compound Sh'va was called Ma'rīkh (מַאֲרִיךְ *prolonging*), with a short Hhirik it was called Hhīrūk (חִירֹוק *gnashing*).

5. The place of Methegh is frequently supplied by an accent chosen agreeably to the laws of consecution, § 39. 3. *b.*, e. g. אֲנִימָמָם Isa. 66:13, לֹאֲלֵהֵיחָם Deut. 12:31, וְאַסְעֵרָם Zech. 7:14, וְעִלִּיצָבָא Num. 10:23, וַיִּקְהָלוּ Josh. 22:12.

a. The want of consistency or of uniformity, which may be occasionally observed, in regard to the insertion or omission of Methegh, e. g. שְׁאֲהָבָה Cant. 1:7, שְׁאֲהָבָה Cant. 3:1; שִׁיחַ Cant. 6:5, שִׁיחַ Lam. 4:9;

עֲרֵבוֹת Num. 31:12, עֲרֵבוֹת Josh. 4:13, and the discrepancies between different manuscripts and editions, e. g. אֶלְכָה or אֵלְכָה Gen. 45:28, שְׁאוּרִמָּה or שְׁאוּרִמָּה Ps. 81:3, if not arising in the first instance from clerical errors, are probably to be attributed to the inferior importance of the sign itself, whose place might be presumed to be sufficiently determined even if not written.

### K'RI AND K'THIBH.

§ 46. Various notes extracted from the Masora (מסורה *tradition*), a collection of remarks upon the text, are found in the margin of the Hebrew Bible, which are explained in the glossary at the end of most editions. The most important of these are the various readings known as the K'rī (קרי *read*), and K'thibh (כתוב *written*). If in any instance traditional usage sanctioned a reading different from that which was written in the text or the K'thibh, the punctuators did not venture to alter the text itself for the sake of making the correction; they went no further than to connect with the letters of the text the vowels of the word to be substituted for it in reading or the K'ri, with a reference to the margin where the letters of the substitute might be found. Thus, with the word וַיֹּאמְרוּ Josh. 6:7 is connected the marginal note וַיֹּאמְרוּ קרי. The vowels here attached to the K'thibh belong not to it but to the unpointed word in the margin, which is accordingly וַיֹּאמְרוּ. The proper vowels for the pronunciation of the K'thibh are not written, but must be supplied from a knowledge of the form indicated by the letters, which in this case is וַיֹּאמְרוּ. Again, in ver. 9, תִּקְעוּ in the text refers to תִּקְעוּ ק in the margin; the K'ri is here תִּקְעוּ, and the K'thibh, whose vowels are left to be determined by the reader, תִּקְעוּ. Jer. 42:6 has אֲנִי where the marginal note is אֲנִי קרי; the K'ri is accordingly אֲנִי, and the K'thibh אֲנִי. In order to indicate that a given word was to be omitted in reading, it was left unpointed, and the

note *כתוב ולא קרי*, *written but not read*, placed in the margin, e. g. *חמש* Ezek. 48:16, *נא* 2 Kin. 5:18, *יִדְרֹךְ* Jer. 51:3. If, on the other hand, a word was to be supplied, its vowels were inserted in the text and its letters placed in the margin, with the note *קרי ולא כתוב*, *read but not written*, e. g. Judg. 20:13 in the text *בני*, and in the margin *בני*, to be read *בְּנִי*; so Jer. 31:38 *בָּאִים*. In 1 Kin. 21:8 the first letter of *הַסְפָּרִים* is left unpointed as superfluous, and in Job 2:7 *עַר* is explained by the margin to stand for *וְעַר*: so Jer. 18:23 *וְהָיִי* for *וְהָיִי*.

*a.* The number of these marginal readings differs in different editions. Elias Levita states that there are 848. Others have computed them to be 1,000; others still, 1,200.

§ 47. Sometimes a different reading from that of the text is suggested by the points alone without a marginal note being added in explanation, as when a particular word or orthography is regularly substituted for another of frequent occurrence. These cases are presumed to be so familiar to the reader as to require no other index of their existence than the presence of the appropriate vowels. Thus, the divine name *יהוה*, which the Jews had a superstitious dread of pronouncing, was and still is read by them as if it were *אֲדֹנָי* Lord, whose points it accordingly receives, *יְהוָה*, unless these two names stand in immediate connection, when, to avoid repetition, it is read *אֱלֹהִים* and pointed *יְהוָה* Gen. 15:2, Hab. 3:19. The antiquity of this superstition is attested by the *Kύριος* of the Septuagint, followed in the English as well as in other modern versions by the rendering LORD. The true sound of the name never having been noted, is now lost; the only clue that is left being its etymology and the form which it assumes in composition, § 62. 1, from which the conclusion has been variously drawn that it was *יְהוָה*, *יְהוָה*, or *יְהוָה*. The common pronunciation Jehovah is manifestly founded upon the error of combining

the consonants of this word with the vowels of another and an entirely different one. There is, however, especially as it is uncertain whether *Yahve* or *Yah<sup>a</sup>va*, or either of these, was its original sound, no good reason for abandoning the pronunciation familiar to the Christian world and hallowed by the association of constant usage for the sake of adopting another which is, or is supposed to be, phonetically more exact, any more than we need be guilty of the pedantry of preferring *Yeshayahu* to Isaiah because it approaches more nearly to the original pronunciation of the prophet's name. Other standing K'ris, unnoted in the margin, are הִיא, the form of the pronoun of the third person feminine which is used throughout the Pentateuch; this is designed to be read הִיא, though the sound indicated by the letters is in all probability היא. So יְשׁוּעָה read יְשׁוּעָה, and יְרוּשָׁלַם read יְרוּשָׁלַם.

§ 48. In the absence of definite information respecting the origin and sources of these various readings, it is difficult to determine with absolute precision the weight to which they are respectively entitled. The current opinion of the ablest Hebraists, based upon a careful scrutiny of their internal character and the relation which ordinarily appears to subsist between them, is that while the K'ri may perhaps, in a few cases, correct errors in the K'thibh, and so restore the original reading, it is in the great majority of instances an explanatory gloss rather than an emendation. With the rare exceptions already suggested, the K'thibh is esteemed the true reading, the object of the K'ri being to remove orthographical anomalies, secure grammatical uniformity, substitute usual for unusual, prevailing for obsolete words and forms, and occasionally to introduce euphemistic expressions. While the K'ri is probably not to be esteemed the original reading, therefore, it deserves attention as the grammatical or exegetical comment of a steadfast tradition.

## ACCURACY OF THE POINTS.

§ 49. 1. All the Masoretic additions to the text designed to facilitate its reading have now been considered. The correctness of the pronunciation, which they yield, is vouched for not only by the esteem in which they are universally held by the Jews, but by the scrupulous minuteness of the system, its consistency with itself and with the vowel-letters of the text, its affinity with and yet independence of the vocalization of the kindred languages the Arabic and Syriac, and the veneration for the already established text which evidently characterized its authors, since they did not venture to change the text even in the slightest particular.

2. The only additional information which has come down to us respecting the true sound of Hebrew words, is furnished by the mode of writing proper names in the Septuagint version, and the few Hebrew words preserved by ancient authors, particularly Origen and Jerome. These have been subjected to an elaborate comparison with the Masoretic punctuation, and the result has been to establish their substantial agreement in the main, with, however, not a few remarkable points of divergence. In relation to this subject it should be observed, that the Hebrew pronunciation of the Seventy is inferred entirely from their mode of spelling proper names, not from words in living use in the language. The chances of inaccuracy, on the part of the translators, are here peculiarly great. Many names were not familiar and were of rare occurrence; and as no system of vowel notation then existed, they were left entirely to their independent knowledge of the sound of each individual word. These words were written by them in a foreign alphabet, whose sounds did not coincide precisely with those of the Hebrew, and in which the proper equivalents varied somewhat according to their combinations. The true sound was also de-



parted from sometimes because the laws of Greek euphony forbade its exact reproduction. The negligence with which they are chargeable elsewhere was also probably aggravated here, and in fact there are many instances in which they not merely deviate from the vowels but transpose or change the letters. Leaving out of view, therefore, such incidental discrepancies as are to be accounted for in the ways now suggested, a thorough and extended examination of the subject reveals, with all the general agreement, a number of regular and systematic deviations.

*a.* These are thus stated by Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, p. 116. (1.) An *ē* or *ī* derived from *ā* is written *ā*, as *Θαρα* תָּרָח, *Bαλααμ* בְּלָעָם, *Γαβαων* גַּבְעוֹן, *Μαριαμ* מַרְיָם; and on the other hand, *a* is sometimes written *ē*, *Αηλιβμα* אֶהְלִיבְמָה, *Ολιβεμα* קִנִּי, *Κενεζ* קֵנִי, *Γεθ* גֵּת, especially before *η*, as *Κορε* קָרַח, *Ζαρε* זָרַח. (2.) *ē* is written for *ī* and *ō* for *ū*, *Χετταιοι* בְּתַיִם, *Γειννα* גִּידְעוֹן, *Γεδεων* מִצְרַיִם, *Μεσραιμ* אֶחָז, *Οχοζαθ* עֲזִיָּה, *Οζια*. (3.) for the diphthongal *ē* and *ō* their constituents *ai* and *au* are substituted, *Καιναν* קַיִן, *Ναβαν* נָבוֹ. (4.) The vowel letters are softened into their homogeneous vowels *οι* תִּקְרָא, *οι* οὐκρά, *οι* οὐδαβηρ. (5.) Vocal Sh'va is written as a full vowel, commonly *a*, or if an *o* follow, *o*, *Σαβαωθ* צַבְאוֹת, *Ραγουηλ* רַעוּיָאֵל, *Χερουβιμ* כְּרוּבִיִּם, *Σοδομα* סֹדֹם; the final vowel of Segholates is also written *ō* if *o* precedes, *Μολοχ* מֹלֶךְ, *γομορ* עֹמֶר.

3. The regularity of these deviations seems to be best accounted for by the assumption that the pronunciation represented in the Septuagint is that which prevailed among the Jews in Egypt, which would naturally be less pure than that of Palestine represented in the vowel points, and which, moreover, betrays in the particulars recited above a strong leaning to Aramæan forms and sounds. Accordingly the view now commonly entertained is that the vowel notation of the Masorites is correct, at least in all essential particulars, and that it is properly to be put at the basis of all investigations into the phenomena of the language.



## ORTHOGRAPHIC CHANGES.

§ 50. The signs thus far described represent all the sounds of the Hebrew language. Its stock of words is formed by combining these in various significant ways. The laws of such combinations, and especially the mutations to which they are subject, or which they occasion, next demand attention. When a particular idea has been attached to a certain combination of sounds, its different modifications may naturally be expressed by slightly varying those sounds. This may take place,

1. By the substitution of one letter for another of like character, and for the most part of the same organ, e. g. :

*הָיָה* to be, exist, *חָיָה* to live ; *נָבַע* to pour forth, *נָבֵא* the same idea applied to words, to prophesy ; *צִנֵּק* to encircle the neck with an ornament, *חָנַק* to strangle, *אָנַק* applied to sounds uttered in strangulation, to groan ; *רָגַל* to go about as a spy, *רָכַל* to go about as a merchant ; *בָּנִים* to collect, *גְּזוּזִים* treasures ; *גְּבִירֵעַ* a cup, *קוֹבֵעַ* or *פּוֹבֵעַ* a helmet (of similar shape) ; *רַךְ* tender, delicate, *רָק* thin ; *הִקְנִין* to make straight, *הִקְנִין* to straighten the beam of the balance, to weigh ; *בְּכוֹר* first born, *בְּכוֹר* first ripe, *בֹּקֶר* the first portion of the day, the morning ; *הִלָּה* to suspend, *הִלָּה* applied to a bucket, to let down ; *גָּזַר* to cut, *קָצַר* to reap ; *זָהָב* gold, *צָהָב* yellow ; *טָמֵן* to conceal, *שָׁפֵן* and *צָפֵן* to hide away as treasures, *סָפֵן* to cover with boards ; *נָחַץ* to destroy by tearing down, *נָחַשׁ* to destroy by uprooting ; *טָבַח* to slay, *זָבַח* to sacrifice ; *חָבַל* to bind, *גָּבַל* to bound ; *פָּרַח* to break up, flee, *פָּרַח* to break out, blossom, *פָּרַק* to break in pieces ; *קָצַב* to cut off, *חָצַב* to hew stone, *חָטַב* to cut wood ; *פָּהַר* to surround, *עָטַר* to encircle the head with a crown ; *נָחַךְ* to pour out, *נָסַךְ* to pour in libation or in casting metals ; *צָהַר* to shine, *טָהַר* to be pure ; *חָרַת* to engrave, *חָרַשׁ* to plough ; *בָּחַן* to prove, *בָּחַר* to approve, choose ; *שָׁתָה* to drink, its causative *הִשְׁתָּה* ; *חָתַר* to break through, *חָקַר* to investigate ; *נָצַב* to place, its reflexive *הִתְנַצַּב*.

2. By the transposition of letters, e. g. :

*פָּרִץ* to deal violently, *פָּצַר* to urge ; *קָצַר* to cut with the sickle, reap, *קָרַץ* to cut with the teeth, bite ; *נָשַׁף* to blow, *נָפֶשׁ* breath ; *בָּנִים* to collect, *נָכַס* riches, *מִסְבָּנוֹת* storehouses.

3. By the addition of a letter :

Thus, from the letters *צַר*, in which inheres the idea of compression, are formed *צָרַר* to bind, *צוּר* to press together, *אָצַר* to heap up, *רָצַר* to be

*straitened*, נָצַר *to guard, besiege*, עָצַר *to restrain*, הֵצַר *an enclosure*; from גָּז are formed גָּזַר *to cut*, גָּרַז *to cut off*, גָּזוּ *to cut loose, go away*, גָּזוּ *to shear*, גָּזַל *to plunder*, גָּזִית *hewn stone*; פָּרַשׁ *to unfold, make distinct*, פָּרְשׁוֹ *to spread out*; בָּרַם *a vineyard*, בָּרְמִל *a garden*.

§ 51. Such literal changes as those just recited not only serve to express new shades of meaning, but even where the meaning remains precisely the same, they may represent diversities of other sorts. Thus, the distinction may be,

1. In point of currency or style: One form of the word being in more common and familiar use, the other more rare and savoring, perhaps, of the elevated or poetic style, e. g.:

נָצַר *to guard*, נָטַר poetic; בְּרוֹשׁ *cypress*, בְּרוֹה once in poetry; סָגַר *to shut*, rarely סָכַר; סָעָרָה *storm*, שָׁעָרָה rare and poetic; סָכָה *to cover*, once שָׁכָה; דָּעָה *to be quenched*, once דָּעָה; הָעֵב *to abhor*, once הָעֵב; סָבַל *to be foolish*, once כָּסַל; עֲוֹלָה *iniquity*, once עֲלִיָּה.

2. Of antiquity: The pronunciation of a word or its form may undergo changes in the lapse of time. Of the few instances of this sort, which our imperfect data enable us to fix upon with some measure of confidence, the following may be taken as specimens, e. g.:

*To laugh* in the Pentateuch צָחַק, in other books (Judg. 16:25 excepted) שָׂחַק; *to cry out* in the Pentateuch צָעַק, only once (Ex. 2:23) זָעַק which is the more frequent form in other books; בֶּשֶׁבֶת, בֶּשֶׁבֶת *a lamb*, occur in the Pentateuch interchangeably with בֶּבֶשֶׁת, בֶּבֶשֶׁת, which are the only forms found in other books; *a sceptre* שֵׁבֶט, but in the book of Esther שֵׁרֶבֶט; *Damascus* דַּמָּשְׁקַי, in Chronicles דַּרְמָשְׁקַי; *how* 1 Chron. 13:12, דַּן; 10:17 הִיָּה, in earlier books אִיָּה.

3. Of Dialect: The same word may come to be pronounced differently by those who speak distinct though related languages. Thus, the Aramæan dialects, the Chaldee and Syriac, in very many words regularly substitute א for the Hebrew final ה, and the corresponding linguals for the Hebrew sibilants, א being sometimes still further weakened by the loss even of the lingual sound to that of the guttural ע, e. g.:

Heb. *הָדָה* to wander, Chald. *הָדָה*, Syr. *ܗܕܐ*; Heb. *זָהָב* gold, Chald. *זָהָב*, Syr. *ܙܗܒܐ*; Heb. *צוּר* a rock, Chald. *צוּר*, Syr. *ܙܘܪܐ*; Heb. *שְׁלֹשׁ* three, Chald. *שְׁלֹשׁ*, Syr. *ܫܠܫ*, Arab. *ثَلَاث*; Heb. *אֶרֶץ* the earth, Arab. *أَرْض*, Chald. *אַרְע*, Syr. *ܐܪܥܐ*. Other consonant changes: Heb. *בֵּן* a son, Arab. *ابْن*, Chald. *בֵּר*, Syr. *ܒܝܪ*; Heb. *קָטַל* to kill, Arab. *قَتَلَ*; Heb. *רָקַע*, Syr. *ܪܩܥܐ*; Heb. *כִּסֵּי* a throne, Chald. *כִּסֵּי*, Syr. *ܟܨܝܐ*, Arab. *كُرْسِي*; Heb. *חֵלְקָה* a field, Chald. *חֵלְקָה*, Syr. *ܚܠܟܐ*, Eth. *፳፩*.

4. Of simple euphony: An alternate form of a word may be produced to facilitate its pronunciation or make its sound more pleasing, e. g.:

*אַרְגָּמָן*, *אַרְגָּמָן* purple; *שָׂטֵן*, *שָׂטֵן* to hate; *חַמְשָׁה*, *חַמְשָׁה* chamber, *דּוֹג*, *דּוֹג* Achan; *נְבוּכַדְרֶעֶצַר*, *נְבוּכַדְרֶעֶצַר* Nebuchadnezzar; *הָיָה*, *הָיָה* Doeg; *אַלְמוּגִים*, *אַלְמוּגִים* almug or algum trees; *מַלְחָמוֹת*, *מַלְחָמוֹת* teeth.

a. Mere varieties of orthography must not be mistaken for consonantal changes, e. g. *לֹא* occasionally for *לוֹ* and *vice versa*, probably *שְׂכָלִיז* for *סְכָלִיז*, and such permutations of gutturals as abound in the manuscripts of the Samaritans, who, making no distinction in the sounds of these letters, perpetually confounded them in writing, Gesen. Sam. Pent. p. 52. A like faulty pronunciation has been attributed to the Galileans, to which there is a probable allusion in Matt. 26:73. Buxtorf Lex. Chald. p. 434.

§ 52. The changes thus far described result in the production of distinct words, and belong to the domain of the lexicon rather than of the grammar. The lexicographer regards such words as cognate, and traces them back to their common source; but, in the view of the grammarian, they are totally distinct. The mutations with which the latter concerns himself are such as take place in the direct derivation and inflection of words. These are altogether euphonic, are more restricted in their character, and take place within far narrower limits, than those heretofore considered. When words are subjected to grammatical changes their sounds are brought into new connections, attended, it may be, with

a difficulty of utterance which demands some measure of relief, or they pass readily and naturally into other sounds, which are easier of pronunciation or more agreeable to the ear. The mutations thus induced are of three sorts, viz.: Consonant Changes, the Conversion of Consonants into Vowels, and Vowel Changes. These will require to be considered separately.

### CONSONANT CHANGES.

§ 53. The first class of changes embraces those which affect the consonants. These mostly arise from the concurrence of two consonants, creating a difficulty in the pronunciation or yielding a sound displeasing to the ear. This may take place either at the beginning or the close of a syllable. Syllables in Hebrew may, and often do, begin with two consonants, § 18. 1; but the necessity of this is avoided in certain cases by the following expedients:

1. In the beginning of words the weak letter ה is sometimes prefixed with a short vowel, thus creating a new initial syllable to which the first consonant may be transferred.

a. The only instances of this are afforded by the second and seventh conjugations of verbs, the Niphal and Hithpael, e. g. הִקְטִיל = הִקְטִיל for נִקְטִיל; הִתְקַטֵּל probably for הִתְקַטֵּל § 82. 5. b. In אֶהְיֶה Ezek. 14:3 א is prefixed instead of ה. Prosthesis is more common in the domain of the lexicon, where א is always the letter used, e. g. זְרוּעַ, אֶזְרוּעַ *arm*; הַמָּוֶל, אֶתְמוֹל *yesterday*. A prefixed א is even occasionally employed to soften the pronunciation without the necessity stated above, e. g. אֶבְשָׁהִים, אֶנְפִּים, אֶזְרָבָּיִם, אֶזְרָבָּיִם. So in Chaldee אֶרֶם *blood*, Heb. דָּם; אֶנָּן *garden*, Heb. גֶּן. In Arabic the concurrence of two consonants at the beginning of a word is regularly obviated by prefixing ا. Comp. Greek χῆς, ἐχῆς.

2. The first of the concurrent consonants, if it has a comparatively feeble sound, is sometimes dropped.

a. This occurs regularly in verbs whose first radical is י or נ, and in nouns derived from such verbs, e.g. יָשַׁב for יִשָּׁב, יָדָה for יִדָּה, בָּוֵל for בִּוּל, נָתַן for נָתַן, נָחַי Ezek. 2:10 for נָחַי, נָחַשׁל Ezek. 1:4 for נָחַשׁל, and perhaps פָּאָר Am. 8:8 for פָּאָר.

א is thus dropped in נָחַי for נָחַי, אָשַׁר for אָשַׁר; also in a few instances from the beginning of the second syllable of words, e.g. וָאֶבְרָךְ Ezek. 28:16 for וָאֶבְרָךְ; אָזִין Job 32:11 for אָזִין; הָאֲסוּרִים Eccl. 4:14 for הָאֲסוּרִים; מַעֲסֶרֶת Ezek. 20:37 for מַעֲסֶרֶת; מַעֲלָת 2 Chron. 22:5 for מַעֲלָת; אָהָב Prov. 8:17 for אָהָב; מִזִּין Prov. 17:4 for מִזִּין; שָׁלַח 1 Sam. 1:17 for שָׁלַח. These examples likewise admit of a different explanation; א may give up its consonantal power, losing its sound in that of the preceding vowel, agreeably to §57. 2 (2), after which it may readily be dropped altogether.

מ is occasionally dropped from the participles of the Pual or fourth conjugation, as מִלְקָה for מִלְקָה; ל in קָח for קָח; ה in לָבַח Ex. 3:2 for לָבַח; לְטִיחָם Ex. 7:22 for לְטִיחָם; and perhaps כ in סוּחָה Gen. 49:11, which appears to be for סוּחָה.

b. The rejection of a consonant from the beginning of a syllable, when not immediately followed by another consonant, is exceptional; as לִר Judg. 9:11 for לִר; תָּהָה 2 Sam. 22:41 for תָּהָה; חֵד Ezek. 33:30 for חֵד; הַשְׁפּוֹת Neh. 3:13 for הַשְׁפּוֹת; הִתְחַלְלָהּ Judg. 9:9 for הִתְחַלְלָהּ, and perhaps שׁוּב Jer. 42:10, which seems to be for שׁוּב.

### 3. The second consonant is sometimes dropped, if it is a letter of feeble sound.

a. This is regularly the case with ה of the article and of verbal prefixes, and י as the final radical of verbs, e.g. לְהַבִּיחַ for לְהַבִּיחַ; יִקְטֹל for יִקְטֹל; גָּלוּ for גָּלוּ.

It occurs besides in a few sporadic examples with these same letters, and more rarely still with א, ו, and ע, e.g. נִי Ezek. 2:10 for נִי; יִהְיֶה for יִהְיֶה; יִקְטֹל with Daghesth-forte conservative for יִקְטֹל; וְיָהִי Lam. 3:53 for וְיָהִי; הָרִיזָה Gen. 3:16 for הָרִיזָה; מִלְכָּנוּ Job 35:11 for מִלְכָּנוּ; תִּמְלִיךְ Ex. 26:24 for תִּמְלִיךְ; וְהָאֲזָנִי 2 Sam. 22:40 for וְהָאֲזָנִי; רָחֵל Isa. 3:24 for רָחֵל; עָרִי for עָרִי; וְיָמִים for וְיָמִים; בִּי as a particle of entreaty, probably for בִּי; נִשְׁקָה Am. 8:8 (K'thibh) for נִשְׁקָה; בָּל the name of a Babylonish deity for בָּל is a foreign contraction. The conjecture that בָּכוּ Mic. 1:10 is for בָּכוּ in *Accho* is ingenious and favoured by the occurrence of בָּגַח in *Gath* in the parallel clause; but it is at variance with the points, which, upon this hypothesis, should be בָּכוּ.

b. In rare cases this rejection occurs even after a mixed syllable, whose final consonant is thus drawn forward, e.g. אָמָה for אָמָה; חָמָה Job 29:6 for חָמָה; תִּתְחַבֵּב Ex. 2:4 for תִּתְחַבֵּב and probably אָסַק Ps. 139:8 with Daghesth-forte conservative for אָסַק.

§ 54. When the concurrence takes place at the close of a syllable, whether the second consonant belongs to the same syllable with the first as at the end of words, or to a different syllable as in the middle of words, the following changes may be produced.

1. An aspirate following another consonant loses its aspiration, § 21; or if it be brought into juxtaposition with its like so as to form a doubled letter, the aspiration of both will be removed, § 23. 2, unless the combination occurs at the end of a word, where the reduplication is not expressed, § 25. Thus, *מָהָה* for *מֶהָה*, *הִתְתַּמֵּם* for *הִתְתַּמֵּם*, *לִבְהֵן* for *לִבְהֵן*, but *רַב* from *רַבב*, *מִשְׁרֵת* 1 Kin. 1 : 15 for *מִשְׁרֵת* or *מִשְׁרֵת*, *מִחֲבֶתָה* Ezek. 4 : 3 for *מִחֲבֶתָה*, *מִשְׁחָה* Mal. 1 : 14 for *מִשְׁחָה*.

2. The first of two concurring consonants is in certain cases assimilated to the second, the doubling thus occasioned being expressed as in the case of letters originally alike by Dagghesh-forte, except at the end of words, § 25, where Dagghesh disappears or is only virtually present, being resumed upon the addition of a fresh vowel or syllable. This is most frequently the case with the liquid *נ*, rarely with *ל* and *ר* and only in particular words; so *ה* of the Hithpael of verbs before *ד* and *ט*, and in a few instances before sibilants and other letters, and *ד* at the end of a few words before *ה*. Thus, *יִנְתָּן* for *יִנְתָּן*, *מִתַּת* for *מִתַּת*; *יִלְקַח* for *יִלְקַח*, *יִדְבָּא* Ezek. 27 : 23 for *יִדְבָּא* Am. 6 : 2; *אֲשֶׁר לִי* for *אֲשֶׁר לִי*; *יִתְּנָה* for *יִתְּנָה*, *יִשְׁמָא* for *יִשְׁמָא*, *הִתְּנָה* for *הִתְּנָה*, *תְּשׁוּמָה* for *תְּשׁוּמָה*, *לְדָה* for *לְדָה*, *אֲחָה* for *אֲחָה*.

a. So perhaps *כ* in *מִכָּה* according to Gesenius for *מִכָּה* and *מִכָּה* for *מִכָּה*. Compare Greek *συγγενής* for *συνγενής*, *τέτυμμα* for *τέτυπμαι*, and Eng. *il-logical*, *ir-religion*, *im-mature* formed by the negative prefix *in*.

3. A few isolated cases occur of the reverse process more common in Chaldee and Syriac, by which a doubled letter is resolved into two different consonants by the change of the



first or the second member of the reduplication to a liquid  $\aleph$  or  $\aleph$ , e. g.  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ,  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ,  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Isa. 23 : 11 for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ,  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Job 18 : 2 in the judgment of some for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  *ends*, though others make the  $\aleph$  a radical, and give the word the sense of *snare*s. The conjecture that  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Ps. 64 : 7, Lam. 3 : 22 is for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  is unnecessary and unwarranted.

4. When  $\aleph$  of the Hithpael of verbs would stand before a sibilant, it is transposed with  $\aleph$  and  $\aleph$ , and with  $\aleph$  it is in addition changed to  $\aleph$ . Thus,  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ,  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ,  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ,  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ .

a. In  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Jer. 49 : 3 the transposition does not take place in consequence of the number of similar letters which would thus be brought into proximity. In the cognate languages  $\aleph$  is likewise transposed with  $\aleph$  and changed to  $\aleph$ : thus, Chald.  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ; so, also, in Syriac and Arabic. The only example of a Hebrew verb whose first letter is  $\aleph$  appearing in this conjugation is  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Isa. 1 : 16, where  $\aleph$  is assimilated agreeably to 2. Compare with these transpositions the frequent Doric change of  $\zeta$  ( $=\delta\sigma$ ) into  $\sigma\delta$ , as  $\sigma\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\omega$  for  $\sigma\upsilon\rho\iota\zeta\omega$ .

§ 55. The occurrence of a consonant at the end of a word may, inasmuch as the succeeding word must necessarily begin with one, be regarded as an additional case of the concurrence of consonants. As the contact is less close, however, than when they meet in the same word, it is less fruitful of changes than in the cases already considered.

1. There are three instances in which it has been doubtfully conjectured that a final  $\aleph$  has been assimilated to a following initial  $\aleph$ ; viz.  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Isa. 35 : 1 presumed to be for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ ;  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Num. 3 : 49 for  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Ex. 21 : 30, Ps. 49 : 9;  $\aleph\aleph\aleph$  Gen. 28 : 12.

a. Final consonants are in Sanskrit perpetually modified by the initial letter of the following word. But it is by no means clear that this is so in Hebrew, even in the examples alleged, as the forms admit of a different explanation. See in regard to the first passage, Dr. Alexander's Commentary.



2. A few cases occur of the rejection of a letter, chiefly **γ** and **ν**, from the end of a word.

a. ך of the verbal endings וך and יך is almost always dropped, being only retained as an archaic or emphatic form, and chiefly at the end of a clause, e. g. רדעו Deut. 8:16, but mostly רדעו; תרבונו Gen. 32:20, commonly תרבו; תעשר Ruth 3:4, commonly תעשר. So, too, in some proper nouns, מגדו Zech. 12:11, מגדו Josh. 12:21; שילו, whose original is shown in the derivative שילוני and is perpetuated in the modern name *Seilûn*.

b. In like manner ׀ is rejected from the dual and plural terminations of nouns upon their entering into the close connection of the construct state with the following word, אֲזֻלִּים from אֲזֻלִּים, בָּתָּר from בָּתָּר.

c. If the feminine endings הִ and הָ have, as is probable, a common origin, this may be best explained by the assumption that ה is in many cases rejected from the termination, leaving only the vowel, though it is always retained when any addition is made to the word: thus, the construct state הַכְּמֶה, absolute הֶכְמָה, but with a suffix הַכְּמֶמֶי; קִטְלָה (comp. אִזְלָה Deut. 32: 36), קִטְלֶמֶי. It is to be observed here, that this phenomenon does not establish the possibility of an interchange between the consonants ה and ח, because ה in this case represents not *h* but the vowel *a*.

§ 56. A few other changes remain to be mentioned which are due to special causes.

1. Nun is often inserted in certain forms of verbal suffixes to prevent the hiatus between two vowels, נֶעְבְּרָהוּ Jer. 5 : 22, or § 53. 3. *a.* נֶעְבְּרָנִי Isa. 33 : 21 for נֶעְבְּרָהוּ, אֲרוּמִיָּהוּ Ex. 15 : 2 for אֲרוּמִיָּהוּ. Comp. Gr. *ánómos* and English indefinite article *an*.

2. Vav at the beginning of words is changed to ו, e. g. וַעֲדָה for עֲדָה, וַיֵּלֶךְ for יֵלֶךְ, וַיִּקְטֹּל for יִקְטֹּל. The only exceptions are the four words וַיְהִי, וַיִּזְרַח, וַיִּבְרָא, וַיִּשְׁלַח Prov. 21 : 8, וַיִּבְרָא Gen. 11 : 30, וַיִּבְרָא 2 Sam. 6 : 23 (K'ri), and the prefixes Vav Conjunctive and Vav Conversive.

3. Vav, though capable of being reduplicated, e. g. **וָוֶה** is in most instances relieved from this necessity by the substitution of **י**, or by doubling the following letter in its stead, e. g. **וָיָיִם** or **וָקָקִים** for **וָקָיִם**.

*a.* In one instance after such a change of י to י, a following י suffers the contrary change to י to prevent the triple recurrence of the same letter, אַרְיֵקָה Isa. 6:9 for אַרְיֵקָה.

4. Yodh before the plural termination ים is in a few cases changed to א to prevent the conjunction of like sounds, תְּלוֹאִים Hos. 11:7 for תְּלוֹלִים Josh. 10:26; צְבוֹאִים Hos. 11:8 for צְבוֹלִים Gen. 10:19; דִּדְנִי from דִּדְנִי; צְבֹאִים (also צְבֹאֹת) for צְבוֹלִים; בְּלוֹאִי Jer. 38:12 for בְּלוֹי (or as some read, בְּלוֹיִי) ver. 11.

*a.* In like manner י is changed to א before וה in the word נֹאֹת for נֹוֹת from נֹוֹה; it is consequently unnecessary to assume, as Gesenius does, a singular נֹאָה which never occurs.

#### CHANGE OF CONSONANTS TO VOWELS.

§ 57. The second class of changes is the conversion of consonants into vowels, or the substitution of the latter for the former. This occurs,

1. Occasionally in reduplicated syllables or letters, כּוֹכַב for כְּכָכָב; טוֹטְפוֹת for טַטְטְפוֹת; בָּבֶל for בְּבֶל Gen. 11:9; צִלְחֹת 2 Chron. 35:13 from צִלְחַת Prov. 19:24.

2. Much more frequently with the quiescents.

(1) A prefixed י is softened to its homogeneous vowel *ū* before other labials or vowelless letters, e. g. וְיָבִית, וְיָבִיר; the softening of an initial י to *ī* only occurs in אִישִׁי 1 Chron. 2:13 for יִשִּׁי ver. 12, אִשׁ 2 Sam. 14:19, Mic. 6:10 for יִשׁ.

(2) Medial or final quiescents without vowels of their own often lose their sound in that of a preceding vowel. This is invariably the case with ו and י following their homogeneous vowels, e. g. הַיָּרֵד for הַיֹּרֵד § 59, בִּיהֻדָּה for בִּיהֻדָּה, unless they are doubled, as מִישְׁנֵי, צִלָּה, and occasionally even

then, e. g. מִימִי for מִימִי. Final א always, and medial א frequently, gives up its consonant sound after any vowel whatever, e. g. מִצָּא, מִצָּא, מִצָּא for מִצָּא.

a. Medial א regularly loses its consonantal power in the future Kal of Pe Aleph verbs, e. g. יִאֲכַל; in יִאֲמַר preceded by ל, thus יִלְאֲמַר; in יִלְאֲהִים and certain forms of יִלְאֲדֹן preceded by the prefixes ו, כ, ל, ב, thus יִלְאֲהִים, יִלְאֲדֹן but יִלְאֲהִי; יִלְאֲדֹן but יִלְאֲדֹן, יִלְאֲדֹן but יִלְאֲדֹן, יִלְאֲדֹן but יִלְאֲדֹן. The following examples are of a more individual character, e. g. נִאֲוֶה for נִאֲוֶה, נִאֲוֶה 1 Kin. 11:39 for נִאֲוֶה, נִאֲוֶה Num. 11:4, נִאֲוֶה Jer. 40:1, נִאֲוֶה Isa. 14:23. In a few cases this has led to a change of orthography, the א which is no longer heard being dropped, or another vowel letter substituted for it, e. g. יִכְלֹ Ezek. 42:5, and יִכְרִל Hos. 11:4 from יִכְלֹ, יִכְרִל Job 8:8 for יִכְלֹ, יִכְרִל Deut. 32:32 for יִכְלֹ, and the examples cited § 53. 2, a.

b. The consonant ה never loses its sound in that of a preceding vowel like the rest of the quiescents. The letter ה is often used to denote a vowel, but if in any word it properly expresses a consonant this is never converted into a vowel, or *vice versâ*. The exceptions are apparent not real, as in the frequent abbreviation of the ending יְהִי in proper names to יְהִי, thus יְהִי, יְהִי. The change here does not consist in the rejection of the vowel י and the softening of the consonant ה, but the syllable יְהִי is dropped, whereupon final Kamets is written by its appropriate vowel letter, § 11. 1, a, just as יְהִי after the rejection of יְהִי becomes יְהִי. So in those rare cases in which ה is substituted for the suffix ה, e. g. שְׁעָרָה Lev. 13:4 for שְׁעָרָה. The proper name פְּדֵהָל Num. 34:28 is derived not from פְּדָה but פְּדָה, a root of kindred meaning, of whose existence, though otherwise unattested, this word is itself a sufficient voucher.

(3) Medial א often gives its vowel to a preceding vowelless letter and rests in its sound; י occasionally does the same with a homogeneous vowel, when preceded by a vowelless prefix.

a. Thus, א: רָאִים for רָאִים, חָטָא for חָטָא; חָטָא Ezek. 25:6 from חָטָא ver. 15; נָשָׂא Ps. 139:20 for נָשָׂא, so נָשָׂא Jer. 10:5; רָאִים from רָאִים; בּוֹדָם Neh. 6:8 for בּוֹדָם; חָטָא Deut. 14:5; חָטָא 1 Sam. 14:33 for חָטָא; חָטָא Isa. 10:13 for חָטָא; חָטָא Zech. 11:5 for חָטָא; this even occurs after mixed syllables, e. g. חָטָא for חָטָא; חָטָא for חָטָא, particularly in proper nouns חָטָא for חָטָא. So, חָטָא Eccles. 2:13 for חָטָא; חָטָא Prov. 30:17 for חָטָא. There is no instance of this with י, on the contrary, חָטָא Cant. 5:2, 12.

(4) At the end of words ו and י, when without a vowel of their own and preceded by a vowelless letter, invariably

quiesce in their homogeneous vowels, ך in an unaccented  $\bar{u}$ , ך in  $\bar{z}$ , which draws the accent upon itself and frequently causes the dissolution of a previous syllable and the rejection of its vowel, בָּהוּ for בָּהוּ, יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה for יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה; יָהִי for יָהִי, פָּרִי for פָּרִי, דָּמִי for דָּמִי.

(5) When preceded or accompanied by heterogeneous vowels, ך and ך are sometimes dropped, or if the vowel be  $a$ , they not unfrequently combine with it, forming the diphthongal  $o$  and  $e$ , § 62. 1, e. g. הִצֵּק for הִצֵּק, גָּלָה for גָּלָה, גָּלָה for גָּלָה, קָם for קָם, הָקִים for הָקִים, מָוֶה for מָוֶה; הוֹשִׁיב for הוֹשִׁיב, נָדָשׁ for נָדָשׁ, מוֹת construct state of מָוֶה, בֵּית const. of בֵּית, הִלְלִיל for הִלְלִיל, הִלְלִיל for הִלְלִיל.

*a.* Vav rarely remains with a heterogeneous vowel unless accompanied by weak letters, by contrast with which it becomes comparatively strong, e. g. הוֹה, עוֹר, רוֹח.

### VOWEL CHANGES.

§ 58. 1. The third class of changes embraces those which take place in the vowels. The primary office of the vowels is to aid in pronouncing the consonants, to which consequently they are quite subordinate, merely occupying, so to speak, the interstices between them. Their number and variety being greater, however, than is demanded for this single purpose, they have besides to a certain extent an independent value and meaning of their own in the constitution of words. (1) Changes of vowels, while they cannot like a difference of consonants create distinct verbal roots, are yet fruitful of those minor modifications of which etymology takes cognizance, such as the formation of derivatives and grammatical inflexions, e. g. גָּדֹל *to be great*, גָּדֹל *greatness*, גָּדֹל *great*; קָטַל *he killed*, קָטַל *to kill*, קָטַל *kill thou*, קָטַל *killing*, קָטַל *killed*; סוּס *a horse*, סוּסָה *a mare*. (2) They may indicate differences in the forms of words which have

arisen in the lapse of time; לַעַר in the Pentateuch means indifferently *girl* or *boy*, in later books *girl* is נַעֲרָה; הוּא in the Pentateuch *he* or *she*, in other books *she* is always הִיא; the form of the demonstrative הַזֶּה is found only in Genesis, הֵלֵךְ in writers after the time of Moses, הֵלֵךְ in Ezekiel; the plural of the demonstrative in the Pentateuch אֵל or אֵלֶּה, elsewhere, with a single exception, אֵלֶּה. The imperfect notation of the vowels in the original mode of writing by letters alone has, however, left us without the means of ascertaining to what extent such changes may have taken place. (3) They may indicate diversity of dialect, e. g. קָטַל *to kill*, Chald. קִטַּל, Syr. ܩܬܠ, Arab. قَتَلَ, Ethiop. ቀጥለ፡.

2. The vowel changes with which orthography is concerned, on the other hand, are purely euphonic, being in themselves void of significance, and springing solely from the natural preference for what is easier of utterance or more agreeable to the ear. Orthographically considered, vowels are either mutable or immutable, the latter being unaffected by those circumstances which occasion changes in the former. A vowel may be immutable by nature, or made so by position. A short vowel in a mixed syllable before the accent is ordinarily immutable by position, being beyond the reach of the common causes of mutation, e. g. מִשְׁפָּחָה, מִדְּבָר. Long vowels are immutable by nature in certain words or classes of words; but they are only distinguishable as such by a knowledge of the etymological forms which require them. It may, however, be observed, as a general though not an invariable rule, that the vowels of such words and forms as are prevailingly written with the vowel letters are less liable to mutation than those which are prevailingly written without them. Mutable vowels are liable to changes both of quantity, from long to short, and the reverse, and of quality from pure to mixed (*u* to *o*, *i* to *e*, *a* to *ē*) and the reverse, these changes being confined, except in rare in-

stances, to the cognate forms; thus, *i* never passes into *u* or *o*, nor these into *a*. Only as *ē* stands in relation to both *i* and *a*, it serves to mediate the interval between them, and thus accounts for the occasional changes of *i* to *a* or the reverse, e. g. הַקָּטִיל, הַקָּטִלָּה; בַּת for בָּנִית, בָּתִּי; דָּם, דְּמָם comp. יָדָם, יָדִי.

*a.* The exceptional change from *u* or *o* to *e* occurs only in the pronouns, e. g. קָטְלָהֶם, before suffixes קָטְלָהִי; and in the particle אֵת, before suffixes אֵת. There are also a few examples of the change of short vowels in mixed syllables before the accent, e. g. מְרַבֶּה, construct מְרַבֶּה, plural מְרַבִּים.

§ 59. The mutations of vowels are due to one or other of the following causes, viz.: 1. Syllabic changes. 2. The influence of consonants. 3. The influence of vowels. 4. The accent. 5. The shortening or lengthening of words. As the vowel of unaccented mixed syllables is always short, and that of simple syllables long, § 18. 2, it is evident that a change in the character of a syllable will involve a corresponding change in its vowel, unless the accent interfere to prevent. Accordingly, when for any cause a mixed syllable becomes simple, its short vowel will be converted into a long one; and when a simple syllable becomes mixed, the reverse change will take place, e. g. הָרִים, הָרִי; קָמָה, קָמָה. In the case of the vowels *i* and *u* there is frequently an additional change of quality, viz., of *ī* to *ē* and *ū* to *ō*, e. g. הָקִים for הָקִים; כּוֹלֵן for כּוֹלֵן in place of כּוֹלֵן § 56. 3.

*a.* Daghesth-forte is thus resolved by the prolongation of the previous vowel in קָמוֹשׁ, קָמוֹשׁ; פִּלְגָּשׁ, פִּלְגָּשׁ; חֲמִישִׁי, חֲמִישִׁי; מוֹרִיגִים, מוֹרִיגִים; הַתְּפַקְרוֹי for הַתְּפַקְרוֹי; Eccles. 9:12 for מְרַבֶּה; Lam. 1:8. if this is for נָדָה see ver. 17; and if the conjecture of Gesenius (Thesaurus, p. 483) be correct as to the true reading in 1 Chron. 23:6, 24:3 יִתְלָם for יִתְלָם.

§ 60. Contiguous consonants may give rise to vowel changes by their individual peculiarities, as is the case with



the gutturals, or by their concurrence. The peculiarities of the gutturals are fourfold, viz.:

1. A preference for the vowel Pattahh of the same organ, into which, consequently, a preceding or accompanying vowel is frequently converted, e. g. שְׁלַח for שֶׁלַח; פָּעַם for שֶׁפַּעַם; יִגְבֶּה for יִגְבֶּה; שִׁמֵּע for שֶׁמִּיע; שִׁנְאָה from שִׁנְאָה.

*a.* The instances in which this permutation occurs cannot easily be embraced under any general rules. In some cases it was optional; in others, usage decides for it or against it without, however, being absolutely uniform. The following statements embrace what is of most importance. (1) The stability of the vowel often depends upon the weight attached to it in the etymological form; thus, שִׁמֵּע in the imperative but not in the infinitive for שֶׁמִּיע; רִשְׁמִיע for רִשְׁמִיע, but שִׁמֵּע not שֶׁמִּיע for שִׁמֵּע. (2) The vowel preceding the guttural is more liable to change than that which succeeds it, e. g. יִשְׁמֵע always, but יִמְעַל and יִמְעַל; וְיִחַם but וְיִחַם; וְיִחַם but וְיִחַם. (3) An accented vowel is sometimes retained where one unaccented would suffer change, e. g. בְּרַחֲמֵי but בְּרַחֲמֵי; לֶחֶם but לֶחֶם. (4) *O* and *u* are less subject to alteration than *i* and *e*, e. g. פָּעַל for פָּעַל; *a* which is already cognate with the gutturals is mostly retained, though it occasionally becomes *ā* before ה, e. g. אֶחָד from אֶחָד, Job 31:24 (in most copies) from מִבְּטָח, רִמָּה from רִמָּה. (5) א in many cases prefers the diphthongal vowels *e* and *o*, thus אֶקְטֵל, נִמְצָא, תִּמְצָא, רָאָה but רָאָה; רָאָה, רָאָה. (6) ר partakes of this preference for *ā* to a limited extent, e. g. וְיִסָּר for וְיִסָּר or וְיִסָּר; וְיִסָּר from וְיִסָּר.

2. The reception of Pattahh furtive, § 17, at the end of a word after a long heterogeneous vowel (i. e. any other than *a*), or before a vowelless final consonant, e. g. רַע, יִגְבֶּה, נָח, יִגְבֶּה, יִגְבֶּה.

*a.* This is necessary when the vowel preceding a final guttural cannot be converted into Pattahh. Sometimes the form with Pattahh and that with Pattahh furtive occur interchangeably, e. g. לִשְׁלַח and לִשְׁלַח, or with a slight distinction, as אֶשְׁלַח, in pause: אֶשְׁלַח; מִזְבֵּחַ, construct מִזְבֵּחַ. In a few instances a guttural preceding a final vowelless letter takes simple Sh'va instead of Pattahh furtive, e. g. לִקְרָה 1 Kin. 14:3, and in most editions שִׁבְחָה Jer. 13:25. As final א is always either quiescent or otiant, it never receives Pattahh furtive. The letter ר never takes it unless it be in a single instance, and that in a penultimate syllable יִרְדֶּה Ps. 7:6, which is probably to be read *yiraddōph*; though it might be pronounced *yiraddōph*, which some conceive to be an anomalous form for יִרְדֶּה, after the analogy of יִצְחָק Gen. 21:6, the compound Sh'va being lengthened into a vowel followed by euphonic Dagghesh, as in the related words





הַמִּרְמָרִי Isa. 44:13; הַמִּרְמָרִי Job 16:16 (K'ri in some copies), הַמִּרְמָרִי Lam. 1:20, הַמִּרְמָרִי Isa. 52:14, הַמִּרְמָרִי 1 Sam. 28:14.

c. Before another guttural the compound Sh'va is frequently replaced by the corresponding short vowel, e. g. הַמִּרְמָרִי for הַמִּרְמָרִי, הַמִּרְמָרִי for הַמִּרְמָרִי, הַמִּרְמָרִי for הַמִּרְמָרִי; and occasionally under א by a long vowel before other letters as well as gutturals, or by a short vowel with Dagghesh, e. g. אֶבֶן for אֶבֶן, אֶבֶן for אֶבֶן, אֶבֶן for אֶבֶן, אֶבֶן for אֶבֶן. This disposition to render the gutturals more audible by the aid of a vowel is further shown by their attracting to themselves the vowel of another letter, particularly in trilateral monosyllables, e. g. זֶרַע for זֶרַע (זֶרַע), הַשֶּׁעַ, נִשְׁעַ, מִשְׁעַ, קָחַת 2 Kin. 12:9, בָּאֵשׁ for בָּאֵשׁ, בָּאֵר, also קָרָאֵן Ex. 2:20 for קָרָאֵן Ruth 1:20, הַמִּרְמָרִי Prov. 1:22 for הַמִּרְמָרִי, הַמִּרְמָרִי Job 20:26 for הַמִּרְמָרִי, הַמִּרְמָרִי Zech. 7:14 for הַמִּרְמָרִי, and by their sometimes causing an antecedent or accompanying vowel to be retained where analogy would require its rejection, e. g. מוֹצֵאִי for מוֹצֵאִי from מוֹצֵא, הַשֶּׁעַ, הַשֶּׁעַ, מִשְׁעַ, מִשְׁעַ and סְרִיסִי from סְרִיסִי comp. 1. a. (4), מִשְׁעַ, מִשְׁעַ Deut. 32:10; מִשְׁעַ, מִשְׁעַ.

4. An incapacity for being doubled, whence they never receive Dagghesh-forte, and the previous syllable thus becoming a simple one, its vowel is generally lengthened, § 59, *ā* to *ā*, *i* to *ē*, *ū* to *ō*, e. g. מִאֵן for מִאֵן, מִאֵן for מִאֵן, יִבְרָה for יִבְרָה, אֶחָד, אֶחָד.

a. Sometimes an intermediate syllable, § 20. 2, is formed, and the vowel remains short. (1) This is commonly the case before ה, frequently before ה, less often before ע, rarely before א, never before ר, e. g. נִחַם, נִחַם, מִחַר, מִחַר, נִחַם. (2) It is more likely to occur in the body of a word than after a prefix, e. g. רִחֵלְתִּי Ps. 119:43 from רִחֵל, but רִחֵלְתִּי Job 38:24 from רִחֵל. (3) When the guttural comes to stand at the end of the word the short vowel is often resumed, e. g. הַמִּרְמָרִי Prov. 22:24 from הַמִּרְמָרִי, הַמִּרְמָרִי Ps. 141:8 from הַמִּרְמָרִי but הַמִּרְמָרִי Deut. 2:9. There are a very few instances in which Dagghesh-forte is found in ר, e. g. קָרָה שְׁרָה Ezek. 16:4, מִרְמָרִי Prov. 14:10, מִשְׁעַ מִשְׁעַ Prov. 15:1 (in some editions), שְׁרָה Cant. 5:2, see also § 24. b.

§ 61. The concurrence of consonants gives rise to the following vowel changes, viz.:

1. When two vowelless letters come together at the beginning of a syllable in contravention of the law in § 18, the impossible combination is relieved by giving to the first of them a short vowel. This, if there be no reason for preferring another, will be the briefest of the vowels, Hhirik, e. g.

דְּבַרִּי for דְּבָרִי, בְּדַבֵּר for בְּדָבָר, חֲזָקִי for חֲזָקָי. If a vowel has been omitted from the word, the corresponding short vowel is frequently employed, e. g. מִלְכִּי for מִלְכִּי from מִלְכָּה (מִלְכָּה); מִלְכִּי from מִלְכָּה; חֲבַלִּי from חֲבַל, יִחְנֶה for יִחְנֶה from יִחְנֶה. Or if one of the consonants be a guttural, the vowel mostly conforms to the compound Sh'va, which it has or might have, e. g. עֲבָדִי for עֲבָדִי, יִחְזָקִי for יִחְזָקִי, לִחְלִי for לִחְלִי, לִחְפֵּר for לִחְפֵּר, פִּעֲלָה for פִּעֲלָה.

a. Vav before a guttural follows the rule just given; before ו, and sometimes before ה or ח followed by ו, it takes Hhirik; before other vowelless letters it gives up its consonant sound and quiesces in its homogeneous vowel Shurek, § 57. 2. (1), thus וְעָבְדִּי, וְיָחִי, וְיָחִי and וְיָחִי, וְיָחִי.

b. In trilateral monosyllables or final syllables with the vowel Pattahh, the first letter sometimes receives an accented Seghol, to which the following Pattahh is then assimilated, e. g. פִּתָּה for פִּתָּה construct of פִּתָּה, מִמְלֶכֶת for מִמְלֶכֶת, the Seghols being liable to be changed to Pattahhs by the presence of a guttural מִשְׁפָּחָה for מִשְׁפָּחָה.

c. In מִצְאָכֶם Gen. 32:20 for מִצְאָכֶם the vowelless letters belong to different syllables, and the introduction of the new vowel makes it necessary to lengthen the one before it.

2. Although two vowelless letters are admissible at the end of a word, § 18, the harshness of the combination is commonly relieved by the insertion of Seghol, e. g. יִרְבֵּי for יִרְבֵּי, לֶכֶת for לֶכֶת. If either letter is a guttural, Pattahh is mostly used instead, e. g. לֶכֶת, פִּעֵל, יִחֶן. If either letter is ו, its homogeneous vowel Hhirik is used; if the second letter is ו, it will rest in Shurek, § 57. 2. (4.), e. g. בִּית, כְּלִי, תֹּחִי, but מִיָּה.

a. When the penultimate letter is ה or ח, it in a few instances takes Seghol, as אֶהָל, בָּהֶן, לָהֶם, רָהֶם. When the final letter is א, it either remains otiant, § 16, or requires Seghol, שָׂוָא, וְיָרָא, יִרְאָה; a penultimate א either quiesces in the antecedent vowel or attracts it to itself, § 60. 3. c. וְנָאֵח, וְנָאֵח or וְנָאֵח, רָאֵשׁ. The alternate mode of facilitating the pronunciation of gutturals before a vowelless letter at the end of a word by means of Pattahh furtive, has been explained § 60. 2.

3. When the same letter is repeated with or without a mutable vowel intervening, there is often a contraction into



with these exceptions, they are chiefly found in poetry. The vowels י and ם are mostly attached to words in what is called the construct state, ה to words in the absolute; and all of them to the feminine ending ת. Examples of ם: בָּנוּ Num. 23:18, 24:3, 15, חָרְחוּ several times, מְצִינֹו Ps. 114:8. Examples of י: אֶהְבֵּתִי Hos. 10:11, אֶסְרִי Gen. 49:11, ibid., גִּנְבֵּתִי Gen. 31:39, הִבְרֵתִי Ps. 110:4, הִפְסִי Ps. 114:8, רָשָׁבִי Ps. 123:1, מוֹשִׁיבִי Ps. 113:5, מְשַׁפִּילִי ver. 6, מְקִימִי ver. 7, הוֹשִׁיבִי ver. 8, מְגִבֵּהוּ ver. 9, מְלַאֲתִי Isa. 1:21, נֶאֱדָרִי Ex. 15:6, עֲזָבִי Zech. 11:17, רָבִיתִי Lam. 1:1, שָׁלַחִי ibid., שִׁבְלִי Deut. 33:16. It is also attached to the first member of the compound in many proper names, e.g. מְלִכִּי-צֶדֶק, נְבִירֵאֵל, to certain particles, as בְּלִתִּי, זִנְלִתִּי, מְלִי, and perhaps to such participial forms as יִשְׁבֵּתִי Jer. 22:23. Of ה: אֶרְמֶתָה Ex. 15:16, אֶרְצָה Isa. 8:23, Job 34:13, 37:12, חֲרָסָה Judg. 14:18, יִשׁוּעָה Ps. 3:3, 80:3, Jon. 2:10, לִירָה almost constantly, מוֹתָה Ps. 116:15, נִחָה Num. 34:5, Ps. 124:4, עוֹלָה Ps. 92:16 (K'ri), 125:3, Ezek. 28:15, Hos. 10:13, עֲלָה Job 5:16, עֲזָרָה Ps. 44:27, 63:8, 94:17, עֲפָה Job 10:22, הַמְנָה Josh. 19:43, Judg. 14:1, and regularly in the third person feminine of the preterite of לָה verbs. In modern Persian *ī* is similarly appended to nouns in close connection with a following word, to remove the obstruction of the final consonant and serve as a uniting link.

§ 62. The changes due to the influence of vowels may arise from their concurrence or proximity.

1. Concurring vowels may coalesce; *a* uniting with *a* forms *a*, uniting with *i* or *u* it forms the diphthongal *e* or *o*, e.g. הַשְּׁפוֹת Neh. 3:13 from הַשְּׁפּוֹת after the rejection of א by § 53. 2. *ō*; בִּית after the softening of י to *i* becomes בִּית; קָטְלוּ by the rejection of ה becomes קָטְלוּ; יהו prefixed to proper names is from יהו for יהו, § 57. 2 (4).

2. One of them may be hardened into its corresponding semi-vowel; *ī* י with *ī* י may form *ī* י, or the first *ī* may be changed to *iy*, which, upon the reduplication of the י to preserve the brevity of the antecedent vowel, § 24. 3, becomes *ī* י, e.g. עָבְרִי with ים becomes עָבְרִים or עָבְרִים. So, י before ה forms יה, and before ו forms יו, e.g. עָבְרָה, עָבְרִית; in like manner ו is changed before ו into *ūv*, forming יו, which, by § 56. 3, becomes יו, e.g. מְלִכִּית, by the substitution of וּת for ת, מְלִכִּית. *ī* followed by *ū* ו forms *īv*, e.g. קָטְלוּ, קָטְלוּ, פִּירוּ, פִּירוּ, הַמְסִיוּ for הַמְסִיוּ Josh. 14:8. *ī* before *ī* י or *ū* ו is resolved into *āy*, which, joined with the appropriate semi-vowels, becomes י and יי, the virtual

reduplication of the final consonant in the one case preserving the short vowel, which is lengthened in the other; thus סוּסִי with י becomes סוּסִי, and with הוּ, סוּסִי. The same resolution of י occurs before final ה, forming יְהִי, and by § 61. 2 יְהִי, thus נְעִירִי with ה becomes נְעִירִיְהִי.

a. Grammarians have disputed whether in such words as עֲבָרִים, the point in י is Daghesth-forte or Mappik, § 26, and accordingly whether they are to be read *ibhriyyīm*, *malkhuyyōth*, or *ibhrīyīm*, *malkhūyōth*. If the explanation given above be correct, it is Daghesth-forte Conservative. Comp. קָנִים, קָנִים.

b. Such forms as פָּרִי, פָּרִי, פָּרִי from פָּרִי are only apparent exceptions to the above rules. The word is properly פָּרִי, and to this the additions are made, the auxiliary Hhirik being dropped with the cessation of the cause from which it originated, § 57. 2. (4). In עֲבָרִיָּם 2 Chron. 17:11 from עָרְבִי and ים, the vowels are kept separate by an interposed א.

c. In words of לָה formation, such as עֲשֵׂה, עֲשֵׂה from עֲשֵׂה and ה, י, י, it might appear as though one vowel were rejected before another. But the correct explanation is that י is the true final radical, and the forms above given are for עֲשֵׂה, עֲשֵׂה (like קָנִים) from which י is rejected by § 53. 3. In the same way עֲשֵׂה, עֲשֵׂה, etc., from עֲשֵׂה are for עֲשֵׂה, עֲשֵׂה. In such alternate forms as פָּרִי from פָּרִי, the radical י is retained by preserving the antecedent vowel, which, before Daghesth-forte Conservative, becomes Hhirik, § 61. 5.

§ 63. The following euphonic changes are attributable to the proximity of vowels, viz. :

1. Pattahh before a guttural is often changed to Seghol if another *a* follows, and the same change sometimes occurs after a guttural if another *a* precedes.

The particular cases are the following :

a. When (ֿ) stands before a guttural with (ֿ) always before ה, e. g. הָחָג for הָחָג, הָחָג מִבְּטָחָה Prov. 21:22. הָחָלָם, הָחָלָם (also when ח has Hhateph Kamets, e. g. הָחָלָם, הָחָלָם Judg. 9:9), often before ה and ע, particularly if it receives the secondary accent, e. g. הָחָלָם for הָחָלָם, הָחָלָם but לָחָבֶה, לָחָבֶה; הָחָלָם, הָחָלָם, rarely before א and ר, הָחָלָם but נָאצֻחָה Neh. 9:18, 26 but נָאצֻחָה Ezek. 35:12.

b. When (ֿ) before a guttural is followed by another consonant with (ֿ) or (ֿ), הָחָלָם but הָחָלָם, הָחָלָם but הָחָלָם, once before the liquid ל, e. g. אָבֶלָה Ex. 33:3 for אָבֶלָה, and once before נ, e. g. לָחָבֶה for לָחָבֶה.

c. In וָאָקָרָה 1 Sam. 28:15 and the combination וָאָר a similar change takes place after a guttural to prevent the repetition of the vowel. *a*; so in וָרָשָׁה Ps. 20:4, and וָאָה after the liquid נ.



2. Pattahh is sometimes assimilated to a following Seghol, or to a preceding Kamets or Tsere.

*a.* The assimilation to (.) takes place regularly in what are called Segholate forms, in which an auxiliary Seghol has by § 61. 2 been introduced between two vowelless letters, מְלֶכֶּה for מֶלֶךְ, לֶרֶב for לָרֶב, אֶרֶץ for אָרֶץ, but פָּצַם, בָּרַח; only before ו, which can combine with *a* and not with *e*, *a* is retained and lengthened to (,) by § 59, אָנָּה, חָנָּה. Rarely in other cases יִרְבֶּם for יִרְבֻּם, where the change is facilitated by the preceding י.

*b.* The assimilation to (,) occurs in a few cases after a guttural with ה prefixed, e. g. הָעָם for הַעָם, הָהָר for הַהָר, הָאָרֶץ for הַאָרֶץ.

*c.* The assimilation to (..) occurs in the Kal future of Pe Yodh verbs where the alternate forms are יִשָּׁב and יִיָּשָׁן.

§ 64. The following vowel changes are due to the accent, viz. :

1. If a long vowel in a mixed syllable be deprived of its accent, it will be shortened, § 18, e. g. הַשְּׂמִיר, הַשְּׂמֶר; יוֹסֵב, יוֹסֵב; יִשָּׁם, יִשָּׁם; יִעֲזֹב, יִעֲזֹב.

*a.* If a vowel preceding Makkeph is incapable of being shortened, it will receive the secondary accent Methegh, agreeably to § 43.

2. The accent prefers to be immediately preceded by a simple syllable and a long vowel. Accordingly an antecedent vowelless letter often receives what may be called a pretonic vowel. This is commonly the simplest of the long vowels *ā*, e. g. קָטַל, יוֹסֵב, לָקַחַת, יִחְדָּלוּן, occasionally *ē*, e. g. שָׁמוּת, גָּלוּת, יִקְצְרוּן, rarely *ō*, e. g. יִקְצְרוּן. Such a vowel is sometimes inserted, even though a pre-existing mixed syllable is thereby destroyed, e. g. in the plurals of Segholates and of feminine nouns derived from them, מְלָכִים from מֶלֶךְ, מְלָכוֹת from מֶלֶכָה.

§ 65. The special emphasis, with which the last word of a clause is dwelt upon, gives rise to certain vowel changes in connection with the pause accents, § 36. 2. *a.* These are (1) lengthening short vowels, viz., (.) and not infrequently (,) which has arisen from (.) to (,), e. g. אָמַר, אָמַר; כָּתַבַּת, כָּתַבַּת; אֶרֶץ, אֶרֶץ; עָבַד, עָבַד, and bringing back Kamets

Hhatuph shortened from Hholem to its original length וְלִמַּת, וְלִמַּת. (2) Restoring vowels which have been dropped in the course of inflection, e. g. עָבְדִּי, עָבְדִּי; דִּבְרִי, דִּבְרִי; עָמְדִּי, עָמְדִּי. (3) Changing simple Sh'va in trilateral syllables and before the suffix הִ to Seghol, e. g. בִּיתֶּהָ, בִּיתֶּהָ; יָחִי, יָחִי; שָׁכֵם, שָׁכֵם. (4) Changing compound Sh'va to the corresponding long vowel, e. g. חָלִי, חָלִי (חָלִי); חָלִי, חָלִי; חָלִי, חָלִי.

a. Pattahh sometimes remains without change, e. g. עַר Ps. 132:12, 2 Sam. 2:27, נָצַלְנוּ Jer. 7:10, צָרָתָי Prov. 30:9, צָרָתָי Job 34:5, אָבְלָתִי Neh. 5:14. Seghol more frequently, מָלָה, צָדַק, מָדַם, and לָמָּה. Long vowels are mostly unaltered; only Tsere is in mixed syllables occasionally changed to Pattahh, e. g. הָיוּ Isa. 18:5 for הָיוּ, so הָשִׁיב Isa. 42:22; הָפֵי Gen. 17:14, וַיִּהְיֶה Gen. 21:8, וַיִּלְלֵה Gen. 25:34, which, in one word of Segholate formation, is converted to Seghol, e. g. לִישַׁע, רִישַׁע. Where the same word has alternate forms, one is sometimes selected as the ordinary and the other as the pausal form, thus יִחְפֹּץ, יִחְפָּץ; יִחְבֹּשׁ, יִחְבָּשׁ; יִטְרֹף, יִטְרָף; שָׁכַלְתִּי, שָׁכַלְתִּי; יִרְבֵּן Eccl. 12:11, יִרְבֵּן 1 Sam. 13:21; עָזָה Gen. 49:3, תִּשְׁבֹּת, תִּשְׁבָּת Lev. 26:34, 35; יִפְשְׁטֵנוּ, יִפְשְׁטֵנוּ. Sometimes, instead of changing the Sh'va before ה to Seghol, its vowel is shifted thus בָּה, בָּה; לָה, לָה; עִמָּה, עִמָּה; אִתָּה, אִתָּה, and in Ex. 29:35 אִתָּכָה. The position of the pause accent, so far as it differs from that of the ordinary accent, has been explained § 35. 2.

b. Of the pause accents, or those which mark the limits of clauses and sections, the first class, viz., Silluk, Athnahh, and Merka with Mahpakh, almost always give rise to the vowel changes which have been described; the second and third classes, S'gholta, Zakeph Katon, Zakeph Gadhol, R'bhi<sup>a</sup> and Shalshleth, e. g. וְנִבְּחֶהְלֵנוּ Isa. 13: 8, do so frequently; the fourth class, Pazer, e. g. 2 Kin. 3: 25, Prov. 30: 4, and T'lisha Gh'dhola, e. g. Ezek. 20: 21, but seldom. Pausal forms are occasionally found with other Disjunctives, thus, Tiphkha וְלֵכֶנָּה Deut. 13: 5, Pashta וְשִׁמְרֵי ibid., Geresh וְשִׁמְרֵי Ezek. 40: 4, and even with Conjunctives, e. g. וְאֵנִי Isa. 49: 18, וְהִצַּלְתָּ Ezek. 17: 15, וְגִשְׁוּ 2 Chron. 29: 31.

§66. 1. The shortening and lengthening of words has an effect upon their vowels. The shortening may take place

(1) At the end of a word by the rejection of a vowel.

This occurs only with (◌) or (◌) in certain forms of לֵּה verbs, e. g. הִנָּלֵּה from הִנָּלֵּה. In 1 Sam. 21:14 for וַיִּצְוֵהּ, וַיִּצְוֵהּ. In the last two examples the short vowel is lengthened upon its receiving the accent, comp. §64.1. If the rejected vowel was preceded by two consonants, these will now stand together at the end of the word, and be liable to the changes described §61.2, e. g. הִרְפֵּה for הִרְפֵּה.

(2) In the body of a word by shortening a long vowel in a mixed syllable, which must, of course, be the one bearing the accent, § 32. 1, or rejecting a long vowel in a simple syllable before the accent (the pretonic vowel, § 64. 2), דָּבָר, מִלֶּךְ; מִלֵּךְ; מִקְדָּשׁ; מִקְדֵּשׁ.

*a.* This is in general the only reduction possible. The vowel of a mixed syllable, if short already, is capable of no further abbreviation; and it cannot be rejected, or there would be a concurrence of vowelless consonants which the language seeks to avoid (הוֹסֵפָה Prov. 30:6 is an exception). And the vowel of a simple syllable, if short, must have the accent, § 32. 1, which preserves it from rejection. The changes above recited are confined to the last two, or, in case the accent is upon the penult, the last three syllables of the word; for the antecedent portions of polysyllables are already abbreviated to the utmost. Contractions due to the peculiarities of certain letters, as the gutturals and quiescents, which have been before explained, are not here taken into the account, e. g. שָׁמַע, נִימַע; מוֹת, מוֹתָה; יָדַר, יָדָרָה.

*b.* Where the last vowel cannot be shortened, it sometimes experiences a change of quality from pure to diphthongal, such as is produced by the pressure of two following consonants, § 61. 4, e. g. הוֹשִׁיב, וַיְהַבֵּל, וַיְהַבֵּל; הוֹשִׁיב, וַיְהַבֵּל; הוֹשִׁיב, וַיְהַבֵּל; הוֹשִׁיב, וַיְהַבֵּל.

2. If a word be lengthened by additions at the end, its vowels are liable to changes in consequence.

(1) Such additions create a tendency to shorten the previous part of the word in the manner just described. For the normal length of words in Hebrew being dissyllabic, the genius of the language is opposed to transcending this limit any further than is absolutely necessary. If the addition is not of sufficient weight to affect the position of the accent, no abbreviation results. But if it is of weight enough to remove the accent, an abbreviation follows if it is possible for one to be made, e. g. דְּבָרִים, דְּבָרִים, דְּבָרִים for דְּבָרִים by § 61. 1.

(2) They produce changes in an ultimate mixed syllable. If the appendage begin with a consonant, the antecedent vowel will now be succeeded by two consonants and be liable to the changes consequent upon such a position, § 61. 4, e. g. הַקָּטִיל from הַקָּטִיל; קָמְנָה from קָמְנָה; הַקָּטִיל from הַקָּטִיל.

קָטַלְתִּי from קָטַל . If the appendage begin with a vowel, it will attach itself to the final consonant, which will in consequence be drawn away from its own syllable to begin the new one. This may occasion the following changes :

(a) If the preceding vowel is an auxiliary Seghol or Pattahh, introduced to facilitate the pronunciation of the second of two vowelless consonants, § 61. 2, it will be rejected, inasmuch as it is no longer required for this purpose, e. g. מִלְכָּךְ from מִלְכֶּךָ , סִתְרוּ from סִתְרוּ .

(b) If it be a short vowel, it must either be lengthened to adapt it to the simple syllable in which it now stands, or rejected on account of the disposition to abbreviate words upon their receiving accessions at the end, e. g. קָטַלְתָּהּ and קָטַלְתָּהּ from קָטַל . The cases are very rare in which a short vowel remains unchanged in consequence of its having the accent, § 18. 2, e. g. מִדְּבָרָה 1 Kin. 19 : 15 from מִדְּבָר , חֲשַׁמְלָהּ Ezek. 8 : 2 from חֲשַׁמֶּל .

(c) If it be a long vowel, it may be rejected, as רָקַטְלִי from רָקַטַל , שָׁמִי from שָׁם , or retained either unaltered, as הַקִּימוֹת from הַקִּים , מִשְׁכָּנִי from מִשְׁכָּן , or with a change of quality from pure to diphthongal or the reverse, מְתִיקָה from מְתִיק , מְתִיקָה from מְתִיקָה , נִסְגָּתִי from נִסְגָּה , הַקִּמְנוּ from הַקִּים , פְּלִיט from פְּלִיט .

TABLE SHOWING THE CHARACTER AND AFFINITIES OF THE VOWELS  
AND THE ORDINARY LIMITS OF EUPHONIC CHANGES.

ORGAN.	QUALITY.	QUANTITY	
		Long.	Short.
Guttural, . . .	<i>pure</i>	$\bar{a}$	$\check{a}$
Palatal, . . .	<i>diphthongal</i>	$\bar{e}$	$\check{e}$
		$\bar{i}$	$\check{i}$
	<i>pure</i>		
Labial, . . .	<i>diphthongal</i>	$\bar{o}$	$\check{o}$
		$\bar{u}$	$\check{u}$
	<i>pure</i>		